

# **For Reference**

---

**NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM**



Ex libris  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Leiper1976>













THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR ..Jean Marion Leiper.....  
TITLE OF THESIS ..The International Olympic Committee:.....  
                  ..The Pursuit of Olympism 1894-1970.....  
                  .....  
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED ..Doctor of Philosophy....  
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED .....1976.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF  
ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this  
thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private,  
scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and  
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may  
be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's  
written permission.











Headquarters of the International Olympic Committee  
Chateau de Vidy, Lausanne, Switzerland



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE: THE PURSUIT OF OLYMPISM  
1894 - 1970

by



JEAN MARION LEIPER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1976





THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE: THE PURSUIT OF OLYMPISM 1894-1970," submitted by JEAN MARION LEIPER in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



*To my parents*





## ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken in order to increase knowledge of the purposes and powers of the International Olympic Committee (I.O.C.), and to evaluate its success in pursuing Olympism, the Olympic philosophy of sport competition.

The I.O.C. is the policy-setting body which directs the Olympic Movement, including the quadrennial presentation of the Olympic Games. The fact that the Games were intended to be a festival to glorify Olympism is not widely known. When Pierre de Coubertin convinced the Congress of Paris to re-establish the Olympic Games in 1894, he believed that sport had more to offer the world than mere competition. A perusal of Coubertin's writings and speeches suggested that he had faith that Olympism could be embraced by all the world's sportsmen, and that it incorporated four factors: (1) the athlete must be an amateur to benefit fully from the sporting experience; (2) sport must develop the athlete in a physically healthy way and lead to character (moral) growth; (3) international competition could increase world-wide understanding and encourage peace and good will; and (4) sport and aesthetics should be linked together through the cultural world of arts and letters.

The task of spreading Olympism and of assuring the perpetuation of the Olympic Games belongs to the I.O.C. This is a unique organization which is completely autonomous and selects its own members from among prestigious gentlemen in many countries who have shown an interest in international sport. The president holds a very potent position and has strongly influenced the actions and attitudes of the I.O.C. through-





out its history. His leadership role is supported by the Executive Board which effectively guides the policy decisions made by the members at the General Assemblies. The I.O.C. depends upon the assistance of two subordinate organizations in order to achieve its goals. The National Olympic Committees are the bodies which carry on Olympic work in individual nations after receiving I.O.C. recognition. The International Federations are the organizations which direct the technical operations of specific sports for the Olympic Games.

An investigation of the I.O.C.'s actions relative to the factors of Olympism was necessary in order to assess the efforts of the I.O.C. to promote and defend Olympism. The most time-resistant problem tackled by the I.O.C. has been that of the amateur requirement for participation in the Olympic Games. The topics of controversy have been: broken time payment; teachers and instructors of sport; expense money; value of prizes and gifts; athletes turning professional; commercialism of athletes; and state amateurs. Attitudes toward the physical and character (moral) development of sportsmen provoked little discussion among I.O.C. members. The internationalism facet of Olympism has been difficult to attain. Although some positive effects were made to promote Regional Games, a World Olympic Day, and the International Olympic Academy, damaging political conflicts also existed in later years. These problems centred in disputes over the two Germanys, two Chinas, two Koreas, and South Africa's racial policies.

This study concluded that the I.O.C. has not succeeded in disseminating an understanding and acceptance of Olympism throughout the Olympic world.



## PREFACE

When word spread across Canada that Montreal had been selected to host the 1976 Olympic Games, reactions ranged from enthusiasm through apathy to hostility. Criticisms were centred in the prospect of political terrorism such as tore the Munich Games apart in 1972, rampant nationalism, and exorbitant costs of facilities. Supporters argued that the Games festival was a great meeting place for nations, on playing fields not battlefields. They claimed that having the best athletes in the world competing in Montreal would raise the interest of Canadians in sport and physical fitness. Often it appeared that all the negative factors were blamed on the International Olympic Committee (I.O.C.) and that any positive results occurred almost despite that élite group of gentlemen, not because of them. With the exception of the knowledge that Avery Brundage of the United States was the president of the I.O.C., little information was known or readily available about the organization, its purposes, functions, or membership. A study to investigate and report such material was indicated.

Initial efforts to secure the necessary documents made it obvious that only the Library at the I.O.C. headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland was likely to have complete sequences of the Minutes of the I.O.C. General Assembly and of the rules publications from the time of the committee's inception. However, three months of research at Lausanne revealed that even those files were incomplete, in some instances, and that very few of the primary source materials had been





translated from the original French language to English. Problems, therefore, arose relative to clear identification and location of some source materials for researchers who might wish to peruse primary sources. To clarify some of the reference material and data reported here, the following explanations are given:

#### I.O.C. Minutes

In the early years, the Minutes of the I.O.C. General Assemblies were circulated only to members. When an official organ of the I.O.C. came into use, extracts, reports, or verbatim accounts of the proceedings were sometimes printed. In fact, copies of Minutes that the I.O.C. librarian allowed this writer to examine were often photocopies of the printed versions of the Minutes. It must be noted that these were the same documents consulted by the I.O.C. staff when they required historical precedents. At the time some of the early Minutes were generated there was no real "office" of the I.O.C. Therefore, although the site of the early original "publishing" of the Minutes may not have been Lausanne, that city has been cited as the place of publication because it is now the only source that can be guaranteed to possess copies of all the Minutes to which references are made in this dissertation.

Frequently, the official organ of the I.O.C. (for example, *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*) is cited here as the documentation source of Minutes. This source is used, rather than the original Minutes, when the facts in both places are identical but the published information has been translated into English or is clearer in its meaning. Some of the Minutes are in a handwriting difficult to decipher and others





have pages missing. [This writer was not permitted access to complete I.O.C. archives.]

In latter years, Minutes have not been printed; rather, only the important decisions have been reported in the I.O.C. official journal. For readers who may be interested in the total sequence of I.O.C. meetings, a chart has been compiled and is attached in Appendix A.

In dealing with the I.O.C. Minutes, much reliance has been placed on Otto Mayer's book *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* [*Through the Olympic Rings*]. Mayer was chancellor of the I.O.C. from 1946 to 1964. He attended all meetings of the I.O.C. General Assembly, and was usually responsible for the Minutes. His book comprises a survey of the business discussed at the General Assemblies and some Executive Board meetings. He has also included the text of some speeches, as well as circular letters which were sent to I.O.C. members. The materials were obviously arbitrarily selected by Mayer, and thus do not include every agenda item, but concentrate on major controversies and landmark decisions. Often, he made personal evaluations of the topics, arguments, and/or decisions. Occasionally, he described a situation with greater clarity than did the actual Minutes. Mayer obviously had access to archival materials which were not made available to this writer.

#### Olympic Rules and Regulations

The *Olympic Rules and Regulations* may also create some confusion as to source. Again, it seems to be impossible to consult a complete set anywhere except at the I.O.C. Library in Lausanne. When rules were



first published they were apparently part of an "annual report." The exact titles varied from one printing to the next. Very recently, the I.O.C. headquarters staff apparently attempted to make the titles uniform and to that end have affixed new title pages to each set of rules. In French or English, the title is now *Olympic Rules and Regulations*, and, therefore, all references in this study are to that title, regardless of the year of printing or the original title. Also, as with the Minutes, Lausanne is given as the place of publication for the rules.

All the rules mentioned are those supplied to the writer by the I.O.C. librarian, except for the years 1927 and 1939. After returning to Canada, this writer received a communication from the director of the I.O.C. headquarters stating that no rules were printed in 1927 or 1939. However, a set of the 1927 rules (now in the hands of the writer) was photocopied from the *Official Bulletin of the International Olympic Committee* of January, 1927, and these differed from the preceding rules of 1924 and the subsequent rules of 1939. They may never have been produced in book form, but they certainly exist in printed form. The 1939 rules have some mystery attached to them. Their format is different from all the others and may well have been printed in the official I.O.C. organ (which was produced during World War II by Carl Diem in Berlin), since the pagination indicates they were extracted from a larger publication. In any case, their content is not the same as those printed in the 1927 *Official Bulletin* or in the 1949 rule book, which was the next version admitted to by the I.O.C. director. Both of these "doubtful" documents are referred to in this study.





The 1971 *Olympic Rules and Regulations* are included in the analysis of rule development because the construction of these rules would have occurred during the time limits of the study, although printing was not completed until 1971. The 1974 rules have been referred to in the introductory chapter only, in order to show the most up-to-date material.

A list of the dates of *Olympic Rules and Regulations* is appended (see Appendix B). Also, the complete amateur regulations from each available set of rules have been reproduced in Appendix B.

### The Olympiad

One of the most frequent misnomers in Olympic terminology is that of using the word "Olympiad" as a synonym for "Olympic Games." An Olympiad is a four-year period of time--the Olympic Games are the sporting event which celebrates an Olympiad. The Olympiad exists even if the Games are not held. Thus, the Montreal festival will be the Games of the XXIst Olympiad of the modern era, even though it will be only the eighteenth time the Games have been held. The Games festival may not be held for some reason (such as the cancellations due to two World Wars), but the Olympiad is still counted. The word Olympiad is not used for the Winter Games as these competitions have no historical connection with the Olympics of ancient Greece. Therefore, the numbering of the Olympic Winter Games is sequential in order of their presentation. A chart showing the dates, places, and numbers of the Olympic Games and the Olympic Winter Games is attached (see Appendix C).



## Translations

Most of the required translations have been made by the writer with occasional assistance from professional translators, or from other French-speaking persons.

## Acknowledgements

Support and assistance for this study has been afforded the writer by many people. A debt of gratitude is expressed to:

The Canada Council, which granted a Doctoral Fellowship for a two-year period;

The I.O.C. and Madame Monique Berlioux, who gave permission for the necessary research at Château de Vidy, Lausanne; and Mr. Migraine, the librarian at I.O.C. headquarters;

Dr. R. G. Glassford, University of Alberta, supervisor of the study, who offered advice and assistance above and beyond the call of duty; and the committee members: Dr. G. Redmond, University of Alberta; the late Dr. W. D. Smith, University of Alberta; Dr. M. L. Van Vliet, former Dean, Faculty of Physical Education, University of Alberta; Dr. R. S. Patterson, University of Alberta; and Dr. Harold Vanderzwaag, external examiner, University of Massachusetts;

Mr. Otto Szymiczek of the International Olympic Academy, who motivated the writer's initial interest in the Olympic phenomenon;

Mr. F. L. Leiper, father, banker, cook, carpenter, and goader to get the study finished; and

Mrs. Elise L. Wittig, who assisted in sorting out the extensive footnotes and bibliography, caught spelling errors and misplaced punctuation, and typed a beautiful final copy.



## NOMENCLATURE

### Congress of Paris

This is the most common appellation given to the congress held June 16-23, 1894 in Paris, France, which agreed that the Olympic Games should be re-established. It was originally called just "International Congress" and then Coubertin changed the title to "Congress for the Re-establishment of the Olympic Games" in January 1894. It has sometimes also been called "Congress of the Sorbonne," particularly by Coubertin.

### Olympic Games Commission

A committee of the Congress of Paris was given this title because it was charged to study the possibility of re-establishing the Olympic Games. Its recommendations were ultimately accepted by the plenary session of the Congress of Paris.

### I.O.C. - International Olympic Committee

For a period of time following the Congress of Paris, the senior organization was called the "International Committee for the Olympic Games." Precisely when the name change occurred cannot be ascertained.

### Executive Board

This elected group of the I.O.C. was called a "committee" until 1955, and "board" after 1955. In order to avoid confusion, the term "Executive Board" has been used throughout the study.





### N.O.C. - National Olympic Committee

Each country which holds I.O.C. recognition permitting it to enter competitors in the Olympic Games has a National Olympic Committee. In some sources, the N.O.C. is simply called the National Committee.

### I.F. - International Federation

The I.F. is the international body made up of affiliated National Federations for the control and administration of one specific sport. Sometimes called International Sport Federation, or International Federation of Sport, the body is habitually designated as I.F. in this study. Specific federations are called by the name of the sport, with the word "Federation" added, for example, the Athletic Federation, or the Federation of Skiing.

### N.S.G.B. - National Sport Governing Body

This is the national organization which controls and administers a specific sport in one country. It must be affiliated with the I.F. for the same sport if its member athletes are to compete in the Olympic Games. Sometimes it is known as National Governing Body or National Sport Federation, but it is habitually called N.S.G.B. in this study.

### China (Peking), China (Taiwan)

Throughout the discussion of the two Chinas, the terms used to designate the two countries and the two N.O.C.s change, sometimes from paragraph to paragraph. An attempt has been made in this study to use the same terms employed in the current I.O.C. Minutes or the source



quoted. Therefore, the nation known today as the People's Republic of China may be called: China, Communist China, Mainland China, Continental China, Democratic China, Red China, Democratic Republic of China, Democratic and Popular Republic of China, China (Pekin[g]), or People's Republic of China.

The nation known today as the Republic of China may be called: Nationalist China, Formosa, China (Formosa), China (Taiwan), Taipei (Taiwan), Taiwan (Formosa), National Republic of China, Republican China, or Republic of China.

#### International Olympic Academy

The Academy is a function of the Hellenic Olympic Committee with the approval of the I.O.C. It is held annually in July or August at ancient Olympia, Greece, for a period of two weeks. Athletes, students, teachers, and coaches from any country recognized by the I.O.C. attend lectures, discussion groups, and recreational sports to learn more about Olympism. All participants must be approved by their N.O.C.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
PREFACE . . . . .	vii
I.O.C. Minutes . . . . .	viii
Olympic Rules and Regulations . . . . .	ix
The Olympiad . . . . .	xi
Translations . . . . .	xii
Acknowledgements . . . . .	xii
NOMENCLATURE . . . . .	xiii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
NEED FOR THE STUDY . . . . .	14
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	15
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	16
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	17
DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . . .	17
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1 . . . . .	19
PART I PHILOSOPHY OF OLYMPISM . . . . .	21
2 DEVELOPMENT OF OLYMPISM . . . . .	22
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2 . . . . .	31
3 FACTORS OF OLYMPISM . . . . .	33
Amateurism . . . . .	33
Physical and Character (Moral) Development . . . . .	37
Internationalism . . . . .	40



Chapter		Page
	Aesthetics and Arts and Letters . . . . .	43
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3 . . . . .	47
4	OLYMPISM AS "RELIGION" . . . . .	50
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4 . . . . .	52
5	SYMBOLS AND TRADITIONS OF OLYMPISM . . . . .	53
	The Olympic Motto . . . . .	53
	The Olympic Flag . . . . .	54
	The Olympic Oath . . . . .	56
	The Olympic Village . . . . .	58
	The Olympic Torch Relay . . . . .	59
	The Ceremonies of the Games . . . . .	60
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5 . . . . .	63
	PART II THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE . . . . .	66
6	FOUNDATIONS OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES AND THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE . . . . .	67
	INTERNATIONAL SPORT BEFORE THE TWENTIETH CENTURY . . . . .	67
	ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MODERN OLYMPIC GAMES . . . . .	70
	FIRST MEETING (UNOFFICIAL) OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE . . . . .	75
	EVOLUTION OF THE OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS . . . . .	77
	Objects and Powers of the International Olympic Committee . . . . .	78
	Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Rules and Regulations . . . . .	80
	Comments on Changes in "Objects and Powers of the I.O.C." and in "Fundamental Principles" of the Olympic Rules and Regulations . . . . .	84
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 6 . . . . .	88



Chapter		Page
7	STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE . . . . .	92
	INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP . . . . .	92
	INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE BUREAUCRACY . . . . .	98
	International Olympic Committee Presidency . . . . .	98
	International Olympic Committee Executive Board . . . . .	102
	International Olympic Committee Commissions . . . . .	108
	National Olympic Committees . . . . .	109
	International Federations of Sport . . . . .	117
	International Olympic Committee Secretariat . . . . .	120
	INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE FINANCES . . . . .	122
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 7 . . . . .	127
8	IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE . . . . .	132
	Introduction . . . . .	132
	Demetrius Vikelas . . . . .	132
	Baron Pierre de Coubertin . . . . .	134
	Count Henri de Baillet-Latour . . . . .	141
	J. Sigfrid Edström . . . . .	146
	Avery Brundage . . . . .	149
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 8 . . . . .	154
	PART III ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE IN PURSUIT OF OLYMPISM 1894-1970 . . . . .	158
9	ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE RELATIVE TO OLYMPISM . . . . .	159
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 9 . . . . .	162
10	ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD AMATEURISM . . . . .	163





Chapter		Page
	Introduction . . . . .	163
	Olympic Congresses . . . . .	165
	Amateurism in the Early Years . . . . .	166
	Broken Time Payment . . . . .	168
	Teachers and Instructors of Sport . . . . .	182
	Expense Money . . . . .	189
	Value of Prizes and Gifts . . . . .	197
	Athletes Turning Professional . . . . .	202
	Commercialism of Athletes . . . . .	206
	State Amateurs . . . . .	210
	Comments on Changing Attitudes to Amateurs . . . . .	213
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 10 . . . . .	216
11	ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD PHYSICAL AND CHARACTER (MORAL) DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	226
	FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 11 . . . . .	234
12	ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD INTERNATIONALISM . . . . .	236
	Introduction . . . . .	236
	SPECIAL PROJECTS TO SPREAD OLYMPISM INTERNATIONALLY . . . . .	240
	Regional Games . . . . .	240
	World Olympic Day . . . . .	249
	International Olympic Academy . . . . .	251
	POLITICAL ISSUES . . . . .	254
	Denials of Political Interference . . . . .	254



Chapter	Page
Invitations to the Olympic Games . . . . .	263
Recognition of N.O.C.s . . . . .	264
Racially Based Political Problems . . . . .	291
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 12 . . . . .	303
13 ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD AESTHETICS AND ARTS AND LETTERS . . . .	317
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 13 . . . . .	325
PART IV DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	327
14 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	328
DISCUSSION . . . . .	328
Introduction . . . . .	328
Amateurism . . . . .	330
Physical and Character (Moral) Development . . . . .	336
Internationalism . . . . .	337
Aesthetics and Arts and Letters . . . . .	340
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	341
The Audience . . . . .	341
The Content . . . . .	341
The Method . . . . .	342
The Leadership . . . . .	344
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 14 . . . . .	347
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	348
APPENDICES . . . . .	360
A INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES . . . .	361
B DATES OF OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS AND THE AMATEUR RULES FROM OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS . . . . .	365



Chapter		Page
C	DATES, PLACES, AND NUMBERS OF OLYMPIC GAMES [SUMMER] AND OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES . . . . .	381
D	NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEES, RULE 24, OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS, 1955 . . . . .	385
E	PROPOSAL BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC ACADEMY . . . . .	388





## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	The Olympic Flag . . . . .	55



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The aims of the Olympic Movement are to promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities that come from contests on the friendly fields of amateur sport and to bring together the youth of the world in a great quadrennial sport festival, thereby creating international respect and goodwill, and helping to construct a better and more peaceful world. [Rule 3, Fundamental Principles, *The Olympic Games*, 1967]

### BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

On June 23, 1894, in Paris, France, an event occurred which was ultimately to touch the lives of millions of people. An international group of sportsmen met and voted to establish a modern cycle of Olympic Games and, by so doing, they changed the face of competitive sport for ensuing generations. The creation of a huge sporting meet to bring together athletes of many nations competing in a variety of sports was a unique idea at that period. Until that time, any effort to revive the Olympic Games had been limited to national contests. Some international competitions had been held but they were single occurrence meetings, not the festival the Olympics has become. Just as the city-states of ancient Greece had once sent their outstanding performers to the Olympic Games, so now the nations of the world would be invited to repeat the tradition that had terminated 1500 years ago. Fittingly, the first celebration of the modern Olympic Games was staged in Athens, Greece, in April, 1896 in a stadium built on the ruins of an athletic



site of antiquity.

Why were the Olympic Games restored? The reasons were both idealistic and practical. The man who reincarnated the idea and brought it to fruition was a Frenchman, Baron Pierre de Coubertin. He was concerned that France seemed incapable of recovering her national spirit after the 1870 defeat by the Prussians. He was particularly distressed by the superficiality of the daily existence of the educated young men who rejected challenge and dedication and chose instead a social life of triviality. With the recollection always before him of his visits to the steadfast schools of England and his studies of the richness of Greek civilization, Coubertin found it difficult to accept the French deterioration. He recognized that one of the common elements in both contemporary English and ancient Greek education was sport, and the question emerged of whether or not the sport mechanism could be used to revitalize the French youth. Coubertin rapidly developed a concept of "pedagogical sport" based on the two foreign influences, a concept which would require a reformation of the French educational system. From this point he never looked back. His theory of sport in French education led to the development of a creed of sport in life that inspired the dream of re-instituting the Olympic Games as a quasi-religious world-wide festival to celebrate the glory of youth and sport. The rest of Pierre de Coubertin's life and most of his fortune were dedicated with religious fervour to extolling the grandeur of his great ideal--Olympism--and to cultivating and promoting his great athletic gala--the Olympic Games.

The origins of many of the patterns of the modern Games lie in



the traditions of the ancient Olympics and were purposely copied by Coubertin. The Greeks called the four-year period between the celebrations an Olympiad and Coubertin re-established this scheme, placing the Games' meeting in the first year of the term. Similarly, he borrowed the idea of the procession of athletes into the stadium, but he replaced the Greek religious dedications with an opening ceremony after the competitors had marched past the reviewing stand. In later years, Coubertin composed an Olympic oath of the athletes as a substitute for the oath to Zeus made by the Grecian contestant. Where the ancient oath stated the purity of the Greek birth of the athlete and his guarantee that he had trained for ten months, the modern version is a promise to compete fairly within the Olympic Games rules for the honour of sport and nation. Since the inclusion of the oath in the 1920 Olympic Games, it has become a sensitive issue because many people believe that some of the competitors have been less than honest in swearing the oath. Although the old Greek Games were restricted to pure Greek citizens (slaves and foreigners were prohibited from participation), the modern Olympics are open to all comers as long as they are bonafide citizens of the country they represent. Seemingly this would eliminate no one, but actually any person in the process of changing his country of residence is barred from taking part until the new citizenship has been legalized. Another deviation from the ancient pattern is the type and number of awards presented in today's Games. The Greek athletic ideal of the search for physical excellence within a spiritual context was symbolized by a prize with no commercial value--an olive wreath from a tree in the sacred *altis* near the Temple of Zeus. Coubertin tried to





reflect this devout motivation by choosing an award with intrinsic worth as an everlasting keepsake--an engraved gold medal. With the exception of the first seven Games, the Greeks recognized only victors, while the Olympic Games of today reward the first three places in an effort to value participation.

The effect of modern society rather than Greek tradition on the organization and program of the Olympic Games is very evident in areas such as the locale of the event, the participation of women, the inclusion of team sports, and the symbols of Olympism. The origins of the Greek Olympic Games<sup>1</sup> were such that their stable location at Olympia was indigenous to their very existence. Every four years Olympia became the centre of the Greek world and provided a unifying factor for the diverse and remote people of Greek civilization. However, Coubertin realized that the spread of the sporting ideal in the modern world would be accomplished more efficiently if the Games were made more international by rotating the site of the celebration among the major cities of the world. The honour of hosting the event would be presented to a city rather than a country in an effort to reduce political manipulation. This is an instance where the purpose of the theoretical design appears to have miscarried in its practical application.

The inclusion of women in the modern Games is a similar case of intention falling prey to custom. According to many scholars, the Greek Olympic Games never allowed women as participants or spectators<sup>2</sup> (with the exception of the presence of the priestess of Demeter) and this prohibition was rigidly enforced. The role of women in nineteenth century society was very different from that of the ancient Greeks and,



although staunchly supporting the exclusion of women as competitors, Coubertin felt they performed a worthwhile role as admiring observers. In spite of this attitude, women were participating in the modern Games from as early as 1900, even though their presence was not officially sanctioned by the International Olympic Committee (hereinafter called I.O.C.). A comparable situation existed with team sports. The second renewal of the Games in 1900 saw the advent of football into the program even though the ancient world had been relatively unfamiliar with team sports. Certainly the Olympics of antiquity were based exclusively on individual competition. The spirit of man versus man contest was one which Coubertin believed developed strength of character and he was adamant that this attitude be perpetuated in the modern Games. Although some members of the I.O.C. have supported this position over the years, all efforts to remove team activities from today's Olympics have failed completely.

Perhaps only through the symbols of the Games can any dissemination of Olympism reach the public. Few of the ancient Greek traditions could be transposed meaningfully to the renovated Games, so Coubertin searched for new emblems and vehicles to build a tradition and emotional climate in which the Games would mature. He was aware that only in such an atmosphere could this new cult of sport in life grow and spread. Thus, over the years, he developed rituals and emblems to make the Olympic Games unique. Most outstanding of these are the opening ceremony, the Olympic motto, and the flag. Much of the protocol for the opening of the Games and the awarding of the prizes to the victors was carefully shaped even before the first Games opening. About the same time, he



borrowed the slogan, *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, from Father Didon's school as the motto of the Olympic Games. The emblem of the five intertwined rings to denote the unity of the world in Olympism first appeared as the official flag at the 1920 Games at Antwerp. The white background of the flag stands for the whole world, the rings representing the five areas of the world, and the colours include the hues of all flags. The torch relay which brings a flame from ancient Olympia to light the Olympic torch in the stadium during the opening ceremony is a relatively recent innovation by Carl Diem of Germany and has become one of the most moving ceremonies of the modern Olympics. It supposedly represents the flame which burned at the Temple of Zeus in ancient times to honour the god of the festival. With no Olympic god overseeing the modern Games, the flame now stands for the spirit of competitive sportsmanship and international understanding and is dedicated to the athletic youth of the world.

Though the world sees the Olympic Games as a gigantic sports meeting, followers of Olympism insist that there is a much deeper significance. Olympism is a philosophy relating the attitudes under which one participates in sport to the individual and societal benefits accruing from that participation. Olympism promotes sport as enriching the life experience, broadening horizons, increasing the quality of daily living, and leading to the fully integrated individual "possessing physical robustness, keen intellect and sublimity of spirit"<sup>3</sup>--as long as it remains an avocation, not a means of financial profit. The Olympic Movement, therefore, is perpetuated to encourage the peoples of the world to participate in sport for fun and enjoyment while creating





stronger, healthier citizens steeped in the principles of fair play and good sportsmanship, and also developing international amity and good will through the competitive contacts provided by the Olympic Games festival. Such full-blown idealism bespeaks the dreamer, and, in spite of Coubertin's determined efforts and inspiring speeches, his vision appears doomed to the realm of dreams.

The source of this philosophy of sport is both ancient and nineteenth century. As has been noted, Pierre de Coubertin was strongly influenced by English schools' sporting practice and the Greek athletic ideal of the sixth century B.C. When he was a young boy, Coubertin read *Tom Brown's School Days* which immortalized Thomas Arnold, the headmaster of Rugby School, as the innovator of school sports programs. Rightly or wrongly, Coubertin believed that Arnold had carefully developed a theory of sport involvement for the students that would produce men of upstanding character and unmatched loyalty to their country. The spirit of "Play up! Play up! and play the game,"<sup>4</sup> which he was convinced permeated all English schools, Coubertin interpreted as the foundation of the British Empire, and he determined to do all in his power to instil such attitudes in French youth. He found influential friends who assisted him in his campaign to have sport become a part of the school experiences of all boys. But the French were not enthusiastic about British ideas, so, to reduce resistance, Coubertin turned to ancient Greece for his central theme. As a longstanding admirer of the humanism of the Golden Age of Greece, Coubertin saw in the ancient Olympic Games and the ideals and traditions of their observance, the elements he required to convince Frenchmen of the great



good of his idea of pedagogical sport. Once thinking along these lines, it was inevitable that Coubertin would immediately recognize the potential of a modern Olympic Games to convey his message. By now his vision had reached beyond the boundaries of France--Olympism was a philosophy for the world to share. Eventually, if not in the beginning, Coubertin saw his sporting ideal as religion. In 1927, he said that the object of the Olympic Games was to enlist youth as "adepts of the religion of sports"<sup>5</sup> so that "Olympism may be a school of moral nobility and purity as well as of physical endurance and energy."<sup>6</sup>

The pillars of Olympism are several. The theory of amateur participation is the most famous, but to Coubertin the concept of character development and of international understanding were of equal importance. In fact, in his eyes, the amateur requirement was necessary to enable the other facets to be achieved. Add to these the ideal of physical perfection and aesthetic appreciation, and the factors of Olympism are complete. Coubertin's advocacy of amateur participation stemmed from his opinion that the building of proper moral character could only occur when the athlete's motives for participation were pure. Sport was to be an adjunct to man's daily life, not the focus of it. When sport becomes the means of financial gain the performers' purposes are necessarily compromised between materialism and idealism. Advocates of Olympism tenaciously believe that character-building potential disappears when pecuniary advantage attends the sporting pursuit. The amateur in his purity of motivation, untouched by financial influence, has an opportunity to derive a "manly vigor and chivalrous spirit"<sup>7</sup> from his participation. The "*élan vital*" of fair play and sport for



sport's sake in athletic endeavours would, in Coubertin's judgement, transpose to total life experience. However, modern sport psychologists question both the transfer factor and the automatic acceptance of amateur virtue.

Coubertin believed that as athletes with untainted motives meet, man to man, in competition, even though they come from different countries, they will have a bond of common experience that will transcend national dissimilarities and lead to international understanding. He would have supported Park's statement:

Whenever representatives of different races meet and discover in one another--beneath the differences of races--sentiments, tastes, interests and human qualities that they can understand and respect, racial barriers are undermined and eventually broken down.<sup>8</sup>

However, Coubertin felt that this outcome could occur only if the competition was individual, when no group identity camouflaged the essence of the performer. A man's attitudes and values are evident only when he stands alone. He takes on the colouration of others when he is one of many.

The insistence of Coubertin, and many of his followers since, on the potential of the Games to promote international peace and good will through understanding is looked at askance in the modern world. Natan<sup>9</sup> claimed that Coubertin was an elitist and militarist. Diem (a German writing in Nazi Germany in 1944) said, "Coubertin was an avowed militarist . . . for him sport was a means of training men in order to make them fit to bear arms."<sup>10</sup> On this point, Coubertin himself stated:

Of all the internationalisms manifesting themselves on this planet, I do not hesitate to proclaim Olympism as the wisest and most effective. It tends to insure peace by giving those ancient and innate feelings of aggressiveness a nobler and more generous outlook.<sup>11</sup>



This declaration suggests that Coubertin was not only aware of the "war minus the shooting"<sup>12</sup> facet of international sport but that he even agreed with Goodhart and Chataway that such "war *without* weapons" may have been an "ultimate justification"<sup>13</sup> for the Olympic Games.

Coubertin was sure that none of these felicitous states of being can be obtained without body health and skill. He believed that a trained condition provides joy in human movement and permits, indeed insists upon, physical challenge to feel oneself more intensely alive. Coubertin eagerly embraced the ancient Greek athletic ideal of the integration of the individual, often carrying it even a step further by modifying the concept of the equilibrium of the whole man to advocate the body as the leading element in the achievement of human perfection. He stated:

. . . there are not two parts to a man--body and soul: there are three--body, mind and character; character is not formed by the mind but primarily by the body.<sup>14</sup>

Olympism also expects an aesthetic sensitivity, "the cult of beauty and grace."<sup>15</sup> The wholeness of man which sport aims for is denied if it does not teach and involve aesthetic appreciation and expression. Sport should inspire the world of arts and letters, and that world, in turn, should enrich the being of the athlete.

The promoter and defender of Olympism and of the Olympic Games is the I.O.C. This is a private, autonomous, and self-perpetuating body--not the United Nations of sport. The members of the I.O.C. are to represent no one but themselves<sup>16</sup> and those who already belong select new members from recommendations of the incumbents, the National Olympic Committees (hereinafter called N.O.C.) and the International Federations





of sport (hereinafter called I.F.), but they are not bound to accept any specific person. The I.O.C. members are ambassadors of the I.O.C. to the country in which they reside, and sometimes to neighbouring countries if no members reside there.<sup>17</sup> This "reverse representation" was purposely designed to eliminate, as much as possible, economic and political pressures on the members, and was established with the first I.O.C. in 1894. Coubertin feared national representation would result in the very sort of impasse that we now see in the United Nations and, as a result, the purposes of the I.O.C. would not be carried out.

The N.O.C.s and the I.F.s are the supportive pillars of the I.O.C. N.O.C.s recognized by the I.O.C. have the privilege of entering teams in the Games when their constitutions conform to the Olympic rules and regulations relative to purpose, duties, membership, and resistance to all political, religious, and commercial pressure.<sup>18</sup> Supposedly, if such is not the case, an N.O.C. would have its recognition by the I.O.C. repealed and would not be allowed to send athletes to the Games. On this basis it would be logical to expect that many N.O.C.s would already have been ejected from the Olympic family. The fact that it has seldom happened must raise questions relative to the I.O.C.'s definition of "political," "religious," and "commercial." The I.F.s are associations for specific sports with which each National Sport Governing Body (hereinafter called N.S.G.B.) affiliates. For the Olympic Games their main responsibilities are to control all technical operations of their sport in the Games, and set eligibility rules which are subject to the approval of the I.O.C.

The growth of the Olympic Games has not been steady nor without



serious problems. National clashes appeared as early as the preparation period for the first Games in Athens in 1896, when the Germans declared that Coubertin had insulted them by "expressing pleasure that the Germans had not been at the Sorbonne Congress" in 1894 and, therefore, they would not compete.<sup>19</sup> The Olympic ship almost foundered completely before the Games of Paris in 1900 and was only saved by the resignation of Coubertin and his organizing committee in favour of a committee of the Paris Exposition.<sup>20</sup> As a result, these Games were run as a sideshow to the Paris Exposition. The same exploitation of the Olympic Games occurred in 1904 when they were attached to the St. Louis Exposition.<sup>21</sup> Steady growth in numbers of athletes participating faltered every time the Games were held other than in Europe until the 1964 Tokyo Games. The same is true of the number of nations represented. Despite this, the total picture of expansion from 1896 to 1972 is impressive. From the thirteen nations and 295 athletes who participated in Athens, the numbers have multiplied to 123 nations and over 9,000 athletes in Munich. The number of sports and events within sports have similarly increased from nine sports with 42 events in the first Olympics to 21 sports with 193 events in the XXth Games at Munich.<sup>22</sup> The growth of I.O.C. membership has paralleled the development of the Games. From the original fifteen members<sup>23</sup> who were citizens of twelve countries, the I.O.C. is now composed of 74 members from 60 countries. In total, over 300 men have been seated on the I.O.C.<sup>24</sup>

Important benchmarks in the development of the Olympic Games must include the acceptance of women, the institution of the Olympic Winter Games, and the proliferation of team sports. Coubertin was



adamant that woman's role in the Games was that of the admiring spectator and, despite the I.O.C. decision in 1926 to admit females, he never altered his view.<sup>25</sup> The first Olympic Winter Games were held in Chamonix, France in 1924. The Winter Games are held as a separate cycle as is evidenced by their numbering. The 1972 Munich Olympic Games celebrated the XXth Olympiad, but the Sapporo Olympic Winter Games were designated the XIth. The Winter Games have caused the I.O.C. much continuing concern. Ice hockey and skiing, particularly, have had a long history of difficulties with the application of the amateur definition to individual performers and sometimes to whole teams.

The inclusion of team sports in the Olympic Games has a deeper implication than their mere existence suggests. Rule 8 under "Fundamental Principles" states, "The Games are contests between individuals and not between countries or areas."<sup>26</sup> In team sports, however, personal identity is subjugated to national representation, an obvious denial of Rule 8. As national feeling seems to be more intense when teams compete than is the case when individuals are involved, team competitions may serve only to increase nationalistic tensions instead of alleviating them, as the Olympic Games are intended to do. For this very reason Coubertin had fought to exclude team sports, but his battle failed.

If it is true that the origin and early growth of the Olympic Games belonged almost exclusively to Pierre de Coubertin and his I.O.C., the Games of the post-World War II era have become the possession of the world. The idealism of the turn of the century society has tarnished in the light of mid-twentieth century. Coubertin's dream of



Olympism seems out of step with the times. Instead of high ideals, those who are involved with today's Olympic Games appear to have more prosaic aims. For the athlete, an Olympic gold medal is still the zenith of sporting achievement, but it is also viewed as a potential stepping-stone to commercial advantage. For the spectator, each athlete from his country is a personal representative reflecting the worth of the national personality and character. For governments, the athletic accomplishments symbolize national prestige politically, socially, and economically.

#### NEED FOR THE STUDY

Many people consider the Olympic Games to be the most prestigious sporting festival in the world. Thousands of athletes around the globe strive for the opportunity to compete in the Games. Splendid facilities are built to house the Game's events, dozens of cities vie for the opportunity to host the celebration, and millions of people watch the athletes perform via television. This modern reincarnation of an ancient festival has lasted for eighty years, but now prophets of doom are forecasting its second demise.

The predictions of an early end to the modern Olympic Games are centred in criticisms of gigantism, financial excesses, commercialization, and professionalism of athletes. Many observers believe that the first three "evils" could be controlled but that the latter "disease" is rapidly becoming epidemic and will drive the Games to the grave. The remedy, they say, is to eliminate the eligibility rules and open the Games to all comers. To date the I.O.C. has firmly resisted





such proposals and, therefore, are branded by many as reactionaries still living in the last century, refusing to face today's realities.

A major difficulty appears to be a lack of understanding by the sporting public of the aims of the Olympic Movement. The philosophy of Olympism, the core of the Olympic Movement, is almost unknown to participants and spectators alike. This incomplete understanding has resulted in a situation where portions of the philosophy of Olympism are attacked or defended but the totality of the philosophy is rarely discussed. The ideal of amateurism is only one pillar of the Olympic philosophy. Other elements as well as amateurism must be seen in relation to the whole philosophy in order to understand Olympism. Unfortunately, the appeal of the competitive events which are intended to celebrate the Olympic philosophy have been so strong as to overwhelm the ideal completely, and, for most of the world, it has become only a shadowy backdrop to the drama of the contests.

This misunderstanding of the purpose of the Olympic Games appears to exist throughout the world, and is increasing with each Olympics. Its manifestation in Canada is indicated by the mounting concentration of the "medal hunt" and increasing concern evidenced by government in the support of potential Olympians for the Montreal Olympics in 1976. Efforts must be made to alleviate Canadian misunderstanding by increasing knowledge and extending appreciation of the philosophy of Olympism and its festival, the Olympic Games.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Critical prime source materials are the Minutes of the



General Assembly Sessions of the I.O.C.; however, reports for several years of the early period do not exist.

2. The Minutes consulted are those approved by the General Assembly, not the original archival notes.

3. All the Minutes until 1952 are in the French language, although some years have been translated for publication in the official organ of the I.O.C. Few of Coubertin's writings are available in the English language. Some other important primary and secondary source material is in French. Therefore, some French documents used for quotation purposes have required professional assistance for precise translation.

4. Some important works of both primary and secondary source levels have been written in the German language. These, plus all sources in other languages, have not been included in the study.

5. Access to both primary and secondary source materials in the I.O.C. Library, other than the Minutes, was limited by extremely incomplete cataloguing. Free perusal of the Library "stacks" was discouraged by the I.O.C.

#### DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study does not include any compilation or discussion of results of the Olympic Games. Specific incidents or achievements have been included only if they are directly related to actions taken by the I.O.C. in pursuit of Olympism.

2. The time limits of the study are from 1894 to 1970--from the founding of the modern Olympic Games to the last year for which the



Minutes are not covered by what appears to be the I.O.C.'s statute of limitations. However, as the ideal of Olympism arises from sources pre-dating the I.O.C., references to events earlier than 1894 must be included.

#### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to identify the historical development of the philosophy of Olympism as the central ideal underlying the initiation and growth of the modern Olympic Games, and to investigate the role of the I.O.C. in promoting and defending Olympism. An analysis of the concept of amateurism forms a substantive subsidiary problem of the study because the amateur concept is significant to Olympism. The dissertation includes:

1. An investigation of the factors which combined to create the philosophy of Olympism and to identify its historical development;
2. A study of the rules, structure, and function of the I.O.C., the organization which acts as trustee of Olympism;
3. An examination of those actions of the I.O.C. from 1894 to 1970 which were pertinent to retaining the purity of the Olympic Games as a reflection of Olympism.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Olympism. The philosophy of sport in life which exemplifies the aims of the Olympic Movement to:

. . . promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities which are the basis of amateur sport, and to bring together the athletes of the world in a great quadrennial festival



of sports thereby creating international respect and goodwill and thus helping to construct a better and more peaceful world.<sup>27</sup>

The facets of Olympism are fourfold: amateurism, physical and character (moral) development, internationalism, and aesthetics and arts and letters.

Olympic Ideal. Synonym for Olympism.

Olympic Idea. Synonym for Olympism.

Olympic Movement. The effort to spread knowledge of Olympism throughout the world. The Olympic Games are a part of the Olympic Movement.

Olympic Games. The competitive sports festival held once every four years which celebrates Olympism.

Olympiad. The four-year period separating the repetitions of the Olympic Games. The Games are held in the first year of each Olympiad.

Amateur. An athlete who is eligible to perform in the Olympic Games. Eligibility depends on the athlete's freedom from financial profit from his sporting endeavours as defined by the Olympic Rules and Regulations.

Professional. An athlete who is ineligible to perform in the Olympic Games because he obtains financial profit from his sporting endeavours as defined by the Olympic Rules and Regulations.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

<sup>1</sup>Rachel Sargent Robinson, *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics*, 1927, rpt. (Cincinnati, Ohio: R. S. Robinson, 1955), Ch.II; see also Ludwig Drees, *Olympia: Gods, Artists and Athletes* (New York: Praeger, 1968), Part I.

<sup>2</sup>E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 47; see also Ludwig Drees, p. 27; R.S. Robinson, p. 109; H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London: Hutchinson, 1964), pp. 124, 183.

<sup>3</sup>John Apostol Lucas, "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 29.

<sup>4</sup>Henry Newbolt, "Vitai Lampada," in *Physical Education in England Since 1800*, Peter C. McIntosh (London: Bell and Sons, 1968), pp. 68-69.

<sup>5</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 100.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>8</sup>Robert Ezra Park, *Race and Culture* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950), p. 254.

<sup>9</sup>Alex Natan, "Sport and Politics," *Sport and Society: A Symposium*, ed. Alex Natan (London: Bowes & Bowes, 1958), p. 53

<sup>10</sup>Carl Diem, "The Olympic Idea in the New Europe," in "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896," J. A. Lucas (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 148, fn. 35.

<sup>11</sup>Lucas, p. 145.

<sup>12</sup>George Orwell, "The Sporting Spirit," *Shooting and Elephant and Other Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), p. 153.

<sup>13</sup>Philip Goodhart and Christopher Chataway, *War Without Weapons* (London: W. H. Allen, 1968), p. 158.



<sup>14</sup>Coubertin, pp. 6-7.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>16</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1974), p. 5.

While the I.O.C. Olympic rules and regulations have been produced under various titles from the first edition to the present time (1908-1974), the I.O.C. in recent years has co-ordinated its Library and has added new title pages for each edition (excepting 1927 and 1939). Thus, all references will be made to the new Library titles, that is, *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (translated from the French where necessary).

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>19</sup>Bill Henry, *An Approved History of the Olympic Games* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1948), p. 44.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>22</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: The Committee, 1972), p. 37, 41-49.

<sup>23</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Directory* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1973), p. 61. [The official list of 14 in the directory does not include Coubertin, and the addition of his name makes 15 members.]

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 61-69.

<sup>25</sup>Coubertin, p. 106.

<sup>26</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 12.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 11.



PART I  
PHILOSOPHY OF OLYMPISM



## CHAPTER 2

### DEVELOPMENT OF OLYMPISM

As Pierre de Coubertin was the father of the modern Olympic Games, so also was he the progenitor of Olympism. Olympism was to become the philosophy of sport in life designed to make the Olympic Games more than just a series of world championships. This creed might be labelled the "Golden Rule" of sport, in that it is based on the personal values to be attained from participation in sport under conditions inherent in the concept. The doctrine of Olympism includes the idea that sport participation provides the performer with: physical and character (moral) development because of the exercise involved and the discipline and control over both mind and body required during training and competition; an attitude of respect for competitors from other nations; and an aesthetic sensitivity flowing from the appreciation of the beauty of movement into other areas of culture. These benefits can be obtained only if the performer is an amateur who does not use sport for his means of livelihood. The expression of these values and conditions would be an enriched life experience which encouraged the development of a "fully integrated individual, possessing physical robustness, keen intellect and sublimity of spirit."<sup>1</sup>

The Olympic Movement is the world-wide effort to promote Olympism which is celebrated every four years in the festival of the Olympic Games. The Games bear a heavier responsibility than merely drawing together the athletes of the world in competition. Their role





is to present the Olympic Ideal to the world through the medium of the sport contests. All the performers in the Olympics are expected to exhibit the Olympic Ideal in their behaviours, attitudes, and skills. The appreciative on-lookers then return to daily life determined to emulate the behaviours they observed. Whether or not this happens, the emphasis on Olympism as a continuing creed, with the Games as the festival celebrating the creed, can be interpreted only as having had such an intent. Certainly Olympic leaders are prone to stress the quadrennial festival aspect of the Games, reminding the public that the athletic contests are a means to disseminate the Olympic Ideal, not just a sports competition.

Coubertin apparently developed the fullness of the philosophy of Olympism over a period of some years. The creed grew out of his desire to see physical exercise become an integral part of the school curriculum. He was faced with resistance from intellectual circles, and in his efforts to convince the academic world he accented the non-physical values of sport. As the idea of re-establishing the Olympic Games became part of his project, his explanations of the benefits of these ventures began to form what is now called Olympism.

Coubertin's earliest concern was what he considered to be the lifeless young men of France in the 1880's. The defeat France had suffered at the hands of the Prussians in 1870 seemed to have sapped the spirit of French youth. This state of affairs disturbed Coubertin and he could see no solution in the schools of the time. His own experience had shown him their ineffectiveness in building enthusiasm, loyalty, and love of challenge in the students--the qualities Coubertin



felt were required for a vital youth able and eager to make France strong again. It must be remembered that Coubertin's assessment referred to his own privileged class who received an extensive education.<sup>2</sup> This élite society was going through a period when intellectual ability was highly prized and most kinds of physical endeavour were considered plebeian. Coubertin's plan for school physical education was revolutionary in this milieu and was also suspected of undue foreign influence.

There was no doubt that the sport habits of other countries had coloured Coubertin's thinking. In 1884, he travelled to England and visited schools there, returning to his own country with an enthusiastic, if possibly exaggerated, idea of the role of sports in English upper-class schools. This experience drove him more fully into the field of educational reform; a field to which he devoted his life and in which the development of the Olympic Games was only one area, albeit the major part, of his work. In these early years the athleticism of ancient Greece did not yet appear to have impressed Coubertin with its potential value in convincing a classically orientated academia that sports and physical exercise could be palatable in education.

While Coubertin's original aim was to re-vitalize French youth and to build energetic and resilient young people, there is no doubt that this concern had military overtones, nor that he was not the only Frenchman who saw a connection between the Prussian success and the use of gymnastics in their schools. For Coubertin, then, to observe the prestige of games in the schools of England and to associate it with the power of the British Empire was an obvious step. If the Germanic and British peoples could use sport to serve them in such a way, why



could not the French?

But Coubertin saw more in sport programs than the building of military readiness. When he began formulating his ideas for educational reform into a theory of pedagogical sport, much wider advantages were incorporated. These were almost entirely based on what Coubertin estimated to be the steadfast merits of the English sports system. He was firmly convinced that the English young man learned fair play, honesty, and integrity from sport experiences. He was sure that such worthy moral characteristics were not confined to the school playing fields but penetrated the individual's total personality if organized opportunities were presented. Another attitude that Coubertin was certain developed through school sports encounters was loyalty. He deemed this virtue to be the highest requirement of citizenship and one that was at a low ebb in the France of the 1880's. Pedagogical sport would promote the acquisition of these character values as well as encouraging a vigorous physical health.

The administration of English school sport also intrigued Coubertin. Through his visits he came to the conclusion that this educational system provided not so much a theoretical preparation for later years as a practical experience of daily life. The fact that so much of the school discipline and all of the sport organization was in the hands of the students impressed the Baron. He was determined that young Frenchmen should have the same opportunity to learn leadership and loyalty through sports in their schools.

Coubertin accorded Thomas Arnold the credit for the virtues he attributed to the English schools. Arnold was headmaster at Rugby



School from 1828 to 1842 and had been an exceptional educator. The attitude toward games which existed at Rugby during his tenure was immortalized in the book *Tom Brown's School Days*,<sup>3</sup> which Coubertin read when he was twelve years old and re-read in his youth.<sup>4</sup> This exposure had left Coubertin with a permanent impression of Arnold as the sole innovator of the school sport programs which were current during his visits in the 1880's. Moreover, the Baron accepted without question the view that Arnold had believed that sport could build socially approved character traits in its practitioners. Modern analysts of Arnoldian theories are equally convinced that the Rugby headmaster held no such exalted view of the role of sport.<sup>5</sup> Rather, they feel that Arnold only allowed the students more participation in games in order to obtain their co-operation in some administrative, moral, and religious reforms.<sup>6</sup> The modern contention is that Arnold had not structured a prominent place for games in his system but that such occurred when he prohibited certain of the habitual activities of the boys and increased the student responsibility for their own recreation.<sup>7</sup>

Therefore, Coubertin mistakenly praised Arnold's vision in appreciating the potential of sport to produce honest and courageous citizens of tomorrow. However, his misinterpretation is immaterial since *what* Coubertin believed was important; whether it was right or wrong was essentially unimportant. In the final analysis, the influence of the Arnold theory as Coubertin construed it cannot be overestimated in its effect on the development of Olympism and the Olympic Games.

The efforts of Coubertin and his confrères to promote sport were gradually showing results. A growing number of schools were





including not only military exercise and gymnastics in their programs, but also games. At the same time these men encouraged the establishment of youth and adult sport clubs, and, finally, the Union des Sociétés Françaises de Sports Athlétiques (U.S.F.S.A.) was formed in 1887.<sup>8</sup> This part of Coubertin's work was to lead to a heightened appreciation of the benefits of international competition, as more and more of the French clubs held competitions with sportsmen of other countries. At first Coubertin appeared to have seen this trend as building French pride, but later his point of view altered to one with a strong international emphasis.

By the late 1880's, Coubertin was beginning to envision a marriage of his two enterprises: pedagogical sport and international sport. He saw a need for an important international sport event to allow athletics of many disciplines to come together at the same time: a celebration of the health, talent, and values of the youth of the world presented on the field of sport. Nothing of such magnitude had existed in the world since the ancient Olympic Games. Thus, the idea of a modern cycle of Olympic Games was conceived.

Coubertin had been an admirer of ancient Greece since he was a schoolboy. He was familiar with classical studies, so much in vogue at that time, and he immediately realized that such reverence could be turned to good use to solve a problem that had hindered the acceptance of his pedagogical sport theories. The French had no great love for Britain or British ways, and yet they were being asked to embrace this foreign system of education. The resistance was extremely strong in some schools, but, if the emphasis were switched from British sport



values to those of ancient Greece, the classical relationship could well mean success. Greece and the role of athletics at the height of Greece's glory became the focus of Coubertin's Olympic Games promotion.

The ideal Greek male was that individual who incorporated physical health and skill with intelligence, culture, and spiritual values. These gifts from Zeus could not be ignored; they deserved to be developed by training and application. Coubertin's interpretation of the Greek attitude was that, "By chiselling his body with exercise as a sculptor chisels a statue the athlete of antiquity was 'honouring the gods.'"<sup>9</sup> Competitive sports became an expression of the wholeness of man through the great "crown festivals" where physical and aesthetic activity were joined in a spiritual thanksgiving and dedication to the gods. Coubertin's veneration of the Greek search for a balanced existence was conveyed in his assertion that:

The Athenians are entitled to the honour of having found the most attractive and genuine formula for sport--sport for the harmony of the human machine, for the smooth equilibrium of mind and body, for the joy of feeling oneself more intensely alive.<sup>10</sup>

Coubertin's vision of Greek purity was based on the achievements of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. He was fully aware of the decline of the ideal, which occurred with increasing rapidity from the middle of the fifth century B.C. onward. Often he used this example to warn modern Olympic devotees of the evils that could overcome the new Games. The Baron recognized the impossibility of perfection either in ancient Greece or 2000 years later. Indeed, he questioned the desirability of such a utopian world. In 1908, after several untoward episodes at the London Games, he declared:



. . . do you believe that similar incidents never decorated the chronicle of the Olympic, Pythic or Nemean Games . . . . Man has always been passionate, and heaven preserve us from a society in which . . . the expression of ardent feelings were shut up forever in the too-narrow confines of decorum.<sup>11</sup>

In 1929, Coubertin explained his own evaluation of the situation facing him in the 1890's and his application of the Greek ideal:

The restoration of the Olympic Games--this time completely internationalised--seemed to me to be the only practical way of buttressing the frail structure which I had just built [that is, school sport associations]. To superimpose on a passing Anglomania the immense prestige of antiquity, thereby somewhat disarming the opposition of the classicists to fasten on the whole world a formula whose fame had crossed every frontier; . . . --this was the only means of ensuring a relative permanence for the sporting renaissance which had just dawned.<sup>12</sup>

Aspects of English sport and the Greek athletic ideal were the sources from which Olympism was derived. All the attitudes and beliefs which are now seen to comprise Olympism were present in Coubertin's theories at the time of the restoration of the Olympic Games, although some were not then stressed in his speeches and writings. It is doubtful that Coubertin ever sat down and structured the tenets of Olympism before presenting them to the world. However, in 1934, he contended that "Neo-Olympism" had been a totality from the beginning when he pointed out that it was not "an uncertain creation whose stages followed one another timidly and haphazardly."<sup>13</sup> He insisted that "Olympism was born this time fully-armed, like MINERVA!--with its programme complete and its geography entire; the whole planet would be its domain."<sup>14</sup> The total concept might well have existed in Coubertin's mind, but he apparently did not enunciate complete Olympism to the world at the beginning.

It was some years before the term "Olympism" came into common



usage. In 1894, in a speech to the Paris Congress, Coubertin alluded to "Hellenic Olympism,"<sup>15</sup> suggesting that he saw Olympism only in relation to the Greek athletic ideal. The suggestion was supported when, later in the same speech, he referred to the:

. . . Olympic idea, which has traversed the mists of the ages like an all-powerful ray of sunlight and returned to illumine the threshold of the twentieth century with a gleam of joyous hope.<sup>16</sup>

Olympic historian F. M. Messerli suggested that "Olympism" has been employed with its present connotation only since 1912.<sup>17</sup> Certainly Coubertin's most prolific use of the word occurred in later years, particularly when he was recalling the motives and events surrounding the re-establishment of the Olympic Games.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

<sup>1</sup>John Apostol Lucas, "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 29.

<sup>2</sup>Albert Shaw, "Baron Pierre de Coubertin," *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, 17 (April, 1898), 436.

<sup>3</sup>Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown's School Days* (London: Dent, 1951).

<sup>4</sup>Marie-Thérèse Eyquem, *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), p. 30.

<sup>5</sup>Brian T. P. Mutimer, "Arnold and Organised Games in the English Public Schools of the Nineteenth Century" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1971), p. 325.

<sup>6</sup>Peter C. McIntosh, "Games and Gymnastics for Two Nations in One," *Landmarks in the History of Physical Education*, P. C. McIntosh, et al. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957), p. 184.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup>Lucas, p. 76.

<sup>9</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 131.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 115-116.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 127.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, Speech at the closing banquet, June 23, 1894, *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 3, col. 3.

The official organ of the I.O.C. has appeared under various titles throughout I.O.C. history: *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games* (1894-1895); *Revue Olympique* (1901-1914); *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.* (1925-1938); *Bulletin of the I.O.C.* (1946-1967); *Newsletter and the Olympic Review* (1967-1976).



[For further discussion of the preceding note, see Chapter 7.]

<sup>16</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 7.

<sup>17</sup>F. M. Messerli, "Olympism," extract from a speech cited in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 81 (February, 1963), 60.



## CHAPTER 3

### FACTORS OF OLYMPISM

#### Introduction

It must be admitted that no specific definition seems to exist which identifies the factors of Olympism. Rule 3 under "Fundamental Principles" (1967) of the *Olympic Rules and Regulations* is as near to an explanation as could be found from "official" circles:

The aims of the Olympic Movement are to promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities that come from contests on the friendly fields of amateur sport and to bring together the youth of the world in a great quadrennial sport festival, thereby creating international respect and goodwill, and helping to construct a better and more peaceful world.<sup>1</sup>

However, Rule 3 did not seem to cover the subject sufficiently. Coubertin, in his writings and speeches, appeared to include interests that the above rule ignored. Notable among these was the theme of aesthetics as an important aspect of true Olympism. At various times Coubertin seemed to stress some facets of Olympism while leaving others to a different occasion. The totality of his statements suggested a grouping of the elements of amateurism, physical and character (moral) development, internationalism, and aesthetics and arts and letters, as being the factors which formed the philosophy of Olympism.

#### Amateurism

The basic argument around amateurism late in the nineteenth century was whether or not the practice of sport could be a source of any pecuniary gain whatsoever for the performer. The true professional



was obvious because his sport performance was his livelihood. The concern appeared to be with the athlete who competed for lesser amounts of money or valuable prizes without being a full-fledged professional, or one who shared in the gate-receipts or who assisted the professional to gain his money by competing against him.

Pierre de Coubertin's version of amateurism was apparently different in some degree from the opinions of those around him. Although he saw the need for a rule stating the qualifications of an amateur, he was determined to keep only the true professional out of the Olympic Games. He did not believe in "absolute amateurism"<sup>2</sup> primarily because he felt that it led to class inequality.<sup>3</sup> Coubertin would have been content to permit lost salary reimbursement,<sup>4</sup> sport teachers as amateurs,<sup>5</sup> re-instatement of professionals under certain conditions,<sup>6</sup> and "much indulgence for pécadillos,"<sup>7</sup> although he denounced "all source of direct profit and of appreciable value."<sup>8</sup> This rather surprising attitude was based on his contention that "sporting spirit" and "sporting loyalty" were the important sentiments to be promoted by the Olympic Games,<sup>9</sup> and that these could not be legislated. Coubertin summed up his judgement by stating: "Amateurism is not a rule; it is a sentiment, it is a state of mind. One cannot then enclose it in the narrowness of formulas; it overflows in all ways."<sup>10</sup>

This position must not be misinterpreted as a lack of faith in amateurism. For Coubertin, the avocational nature of sport was a necessity if the character-building potential was to be achieved. To sell his talent would jeopardize the athlete's "disinterestedness," which Coubertin felt was an essential component. This term appeared





to mean that if the gain were more concrete than satisfaction at an achievement, the purpose of the involvement was denigrated from the spiritual level to the practical one. The victory became more important than the participation. It was the achievement of sizable financial gain from sporting activity that was the central problem to Coubertin, not the punishment of athletes for "pecadillos" or small compensatory income. He was also fearful that the benefits of sport participation would be denied to those of the lower classes if an "absolute" amateurism was required. In 1919, he expressed his thoughts of many years by asking:

In virtue of what aristocratic decrees could there be any link between--on the one hand--the physical beauty and muscular power of a young man, his perseverance in training and his will to win and--on the other hand--the list of his ancestors or the contents of his wallet?<sup>11</sup>

In his report on the amateur discussions of the 1894 Congress of Paris, Coubertin decried the exclusion of workers by the Amateur Rowing Association of England, criticizing its "defiance of democracy which no one could defend."<sup>12</sup>

The amateur rules established by the I.F.s and the Olympic Congress were not very much to Coubertin's taste. In 1934, he argued that ". . . they offend human liberty . . . ." <sup>13,14</sup> In this spirit, Coubertin was concerned that,

. . . under the pretext of preserving the pure amateur doctrine, disqualifications were pronounced against alleged professionals, whose sporting spirit and disinterestedness were nonetheless far superior to those of many duly certified sham amateurs.<sup>15</sup>

Unfortunately, Coubertin's method for assuring amateurism was too idealistic to achieve its purpose. His solution was to have the athlete swear an oath of fidelity to the Olympic spirit, all that was



necessary--in his mind--to guarantee the amateurism of the competitors. His confrères on the I.O.C. obviously had less faith in this scheme, as they continued to structure more definitive rules as the years passed.

Another example of Coubertin's preference for the amateur athlete was revealed in his famous adage, "The most important thing in the Olympic Games is not to win but to take part . . . ." <sup>16</sup> For a professional, winning was the most important thing. The culmination of the above quotation disclosed firm testimony as to Coubertin's point of view on the relationship between amateur sport and life, when he concluded: ". . . just as the most important thing in life is not the triumph but the struggle. The essential thing is not to have conquered but to have fought well."<sup>17</sup>

There was a seeming contradiction between these sentiments and Coubertin's expectations for outstanding achievements by the Olympic athletes. While surveying the "Philosophic Foundation of Modern Olympism" just a year before his death, Coubertin claimed a characteristic of Olympism to be:

. . . an aristocracy, an élite; . . . determined only by the bodily superiority of the individual and his muscular possibilities, multiplied to some extent by his will to train. Not all young men are cut out to be athletes.<sup>18</sup>

Further, he said that these "élite" young athletes were "'Olympics,' i.e. men capable of attacking world records,"<sup>19</sup> and that "they had been given the watchword 'Citius, altius, fortius,' ('Ever faster, higher, stronger'), the device of those who dare to aspire to break records."<sup>20</sup> These comments all suggested that Coubertin held high hopes of the Olympic Games producing the world's best performances.



One reason for this was Coubertin's hope that the example of fine young men achieving outstanding feats would cause emulation among youth everywhere and bring sport to the masses. Nevertheless, such high-level performance expectations stand oddly beside his insistence that taking part was the ultimate achievement.

### Physical and Character (Moral) Development

An emphasis on physical training for health was a central factor of the Greek athletic ideal. The appearance of the body was important to the Greeks as evidenced in the sculptures and paintings of Greek artists. A vase painting exemplifies this, showing a fat boy being ridiculed by his fellows who had splendid physiques.<sup>21</sup> The Greek ideal was not achieved, however, simply by body-building techniques. The trained body had to be not only pleasing to the eye but the individual also had to be a capable athlete. This requirement that unity must exist between beauty and ability was the foundation of Greek athletics and the ancient "crown festivals." Coubertin did not seem to be overly dedicated to the purely physiological result of training. His aim was more in the direction of a total fitness; of the benefits for "physical and moral hygiene."<sup>22</sup> He wrote often of "the physical joy which results from intense muscular effort."<sup>23</sup> The emphasis he placed on intensity of effort made it obvious that "play" could not achieve the ends he desired. These ideas were combined in his pronouncement: "It is a question of the intense physical pleasure which is necessary to the equilibrium of the adult and which he can obtain in a healthy form only through sport."<sup>24</sup>

Coubertin also firmly believed that physical exercise "can help



to forge character [and create] moral force."<sup>25</sup> The greatest importance of the physical factor was, therefore, as a vehicle to empower the development of moral character. This was consistent, of course, with Coubertin's earliest motivation, the rehabilitation of French youth, not so much in a physical sense as in a spiritual one.

It is obvious in the foregoing that Coubertin separated "character" and "moral" facets of personality, but, unfortunately, he never differentiated carefully between the traits that could be categorized as elements of character and those considered to be moral. At various times he referred interchangeably to "moral forces" and to "character formation."

The character and moral development of the performer had a closer connection with English attitudes of sportsmanship, of group loyalty, of "Play up! Play up! and play the game,"<sup>26</sup> and of the importance of the contest over individual ego, than with Greek attitudes. The personal fame which was an integral part of the Greek athlete's victory as a facet of the religious connotation had little relevance in the English sport model. The ancient athlete, of course, swore to obey the rules, but this was somewhat different from the Anglo-Saxon concept of "fair play" which Coubertin admired.

The source of the belief in the character formation potential of Olympism Coubertin placed directly in Thomas Arnold's use of sport in the English schools. The Baron said: "ARNOLD makes the muscles more educated, more meticulous and more constant servants of character formation."<sup>27</sup> Modern sport psychologists would find it difficult to agree to such a transition from the physical to the social-psychological.





For Coubertin, education was the agent of transfer. He agreed that the search for performance excellence alone was insufficient, and explained by pointing out that:

Sport plants in the body seeds of physio-psychological qualities such as coolness, confidence, decision, etc. . . . . These qualities may remain localised around the exercise which brought them into being; this often happens--it even happens most often. . . . how many swimmers [there are] who are brave in the water but frightened by the waves of human existence . . . . The educators' task is to make the seed bear fruit through the organism . . . from a special category of activities to all the individual's actions. That is what Thomas ARNOLD did, and what British educators learned from him.<sup>28</sup>

Other positive character traits accruing from "the voluntary and habitual cult of intensive muscular exercise [were] initiative, perseverance, intensity, search for perfection, [and] disdain for possible danger."<sup>29</sup> Coubertin suspected that "moral nobility" could be attained through Olympism, but only if two further qualities were developing in the athlete:

Olympism may be a school of moral nobility and purity as well as of physical endurance and energy; but only on condition that you continually raise your conceptions of honour and sporting disinterestedness to the height of your muscular strength.<sup>30</sup>

Coubertin also insisted that if competitive sport were to be a positive influence on character formation, the contest had to be of an individual nature, as it had been in the ancient Greek games. The character values which Coubertin was seeking to enhance were an individual matter, in spite of the fact that in this aspect his model was the English system which was team-sport orientated. In 1934, Coubertin argued, "I still think . . . that the Olympiads have been restored for the rare and solemn glorification of the individual athlete and that team sports have no place in them . . . ."<sup>31</sup>



In Coubertin's opinion, the moral values developed through sport participation were expressed during competition by attitudes of sportsmanship. He preferred the word "chivalry" to describe the ideal conduct of athletes but identified as analogous the British concept of "fair play."<sup>32</sup>

All these character and moral traits which Coubertin believed derived from sport were fundamental to Olympism, in that sport was the agent through which Olympism operated.

### Internationalism

The idea that,

. . . contests on the friendly fields of amateur sport . . .  
[could be instrumental in] . . . creating international respect and goodwill and helping to construct a better and more peaceful world.<sup>33</sup>

was a vision of Coubertin, who was impressed by the truce which had occurred during the ancient Games. However, his knowledge of Greek history must have reminded him that no lasting cessation of hostilities ever resulted from the Olympic peace. Nevertheless, he promoted the Olympic Games as a vehicle of international understanding, if not peace, throughout his life, notwithstanding the incursion of World War I.

The importance of the international aspect of Olympism was underscored by Coubertin's insistence from the beginning that the Olympic Games were to include all the nations desirous of taking part. The spread of the salutary characteristics that sport was capable of generating in humanity could not be limited to any one group in society or any one nation. Ease of travel was increasing rapidly at that time and international sport contests were no longer a unique occurrence.



Coubertin was convinced that sport contacts between athletes of various countries could encourage the respect and knowledge of one for the other. He maintained that,

. . . to ask the peoples of the world to love one another is merely a form of childishness. To ask them to respect one another is not in the least utopian, but in order to respect one another it is first necessary to know one another.<sup>34</sup>

Coubertin explained the process of reducing animosities through the fellowship of international sport in the Olympic Games in an 1894 speech:

. . . every four years the revived Olympic Games must give the youth of all the world the chance of a happy and brotherly encounter, which will gradually efface the peoples' ignorance of things which concern them all, an ignorance which feeds hatreds, accumulates misunderstandings and hurls events along a barbarous path towards a merciless conflict.<sup>35</sup>

Sloane, the American professor who was a charter member of the I.O.C., phrased similar thoughts: "Kindly acquaintance is the best solvent of international jealousy and enmity."<sup>36</sup>

That the Olympic Games could contribute to the ultimate achievement of peace was a dream of Coubertin. However, he recognized that the chain of good will necessary to produce that result had its first and most significant link in the individual. B. Henry (whose manuscript was approved by Coubertin) published an interpretation of Coubertin's ideas in 1948:

Peace, Coubertin hoped and believed, would be furthered by the Olympic Games. He said so on many occasions. But peace could be the product only of a better world; a better world could be brought about only by better individuals; and better individuals . . . could be developed only by the give-and-take, the buffeting and battering, the stress and strain of fierce competition.<sup>37</sup>

Although the Olympic contestant was the base of sporting



internationalism, Coubertin felt assured that not only athletes but also spectators and nations would come to develop mutual respect in the non-political setting of the Olympic Games. This certainly did not deny national pride which he felt was essential to the Olympic Games, but, rather, strong national feeling could be set aside in the face of athletic excellence:

We must reach a point where . . . applause is vouchsafed solely in proportion to the worth of the feat accomplished, and regardless of any national preference. All exclusively national sentiments must then be suspended and, so to speak "sent on temporary holiday."<sup>38</sup>

The community of appreciation so developed would overflow into an expression of esteem for the athletic quality of athletes of other nations.

There was another type of peace which Coubertin thought could assist in the attainment of world peace. This he called "social peace," possibly to differentiate from the more politically orientated idea of world peace. By this phrase he apparently meant an ever-increasing tolerance for those who came from different backgrounds, whether national, class, colour, or religion. He contended that these social barriers could be lowered through sport in general and the Olympic Movement in particular. Immediately following World War I he promised:

Now sport can do something more for us; if we know how to let it, it will be able tomorrow to safeguard the essential good without which no durable reconstruction will be possible--social peace.<sup>39</sup>

And again,

. . . sport by reason of its potent physical and moral effects will be an inestimable instrument . . . for the establishment of social peace.<sup>40</sup>

Such "social peace" could be only an advantage in the search for world understanding. In the circular sent out in 1894 to announce the





Congress of Paris, Coubertin wrote:

The revival of the Olympic Games on bases and in conditions suited to the needs of modern life would bring the representatives of the nations of the world face to face every four years, and it may be thought that their peaceful and chivalrous contests would constitute the best of internationalism.<sup>41</sup>

Therefore, from the first days in the evolution of Olympism, internationalism was an indispensable ingredient. To strengthen this element, Coubertin insisted that the Olympic festival should move its site every four years (contrary to ancient custom) to spread the Olympic Idea to many countries. After the success of the first Olympic Games in Athens in 1896, the Greeks campaigned to retain the future Games for Athens but Coubertin held firmly to his original plan.<sup>42</sup>

Another formula for expanding the international influence of Olympism was the "Olympic kindergarten," the extension of I.O.C. encouragement and patronage to geographical area games (for example, the Mediterranean Games) held in parts of the world where sport was just beginning to develop.<sup>43</sup>

Through these actions and attitudes the growth of sport was stimulated throughout the world and the Olympic Games became the zenith of athletic achievement. Coubertin summed up the role of internationalism as a part of Olympism in 1895:

Healthy democracy, wise and peaceful internationalism, will penetrate the new stadium and preserve within it the cult of honour and disinterestedness which will enable athletics to help in the tasks of moral education and social peace as well as of muscular development.<sup>44</sup>

#### Aesthetics and Arts and Letters

One of Coubertin's strongest convictions was that beauty and



sport belonged together as they had in Greek antiquity. From early moments, in his design for the reconstruction of the Olympic Games, he planned that some day "arts and letters" would be contained within the Olympic circle in order to bring sport and culture again into contact with each other. This aesthetic element included not only the physical harmony of muscles and grace but also culture in the form of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and literature.

Coubertin's feelings about the ability of sport participation to create beauty in the human form were vividly expressed in the second verse of his poem "Ode to Sport." He wrote this under a pseudonym for the arts and letters contest of the 1912 Games in Stockholm, and won a gold medal:

O Sport, you are Beauty! You--the architect of this house, the human body, which may become abject or sublime according as to whether it is defiled by base passions or cherished with wholesome endeavour. There can be no beauty without poise and proportion, and you are the incomparable master of both, for you create harmony, you fill movement with rhythm, you make strength gracious, and you lend power to supple things.<sup>45</sup>

His acceptance of the Greek athletic ideal was evident in the final sentence.

Coubertin felt that if the humanistic appreciation of the wholeness of man, which he thought was the glory of the ancient Games, was to be perpetuated in their modern counterpart, the new Games had to include homage to arts and letters as did the ancient Olympics. In 1904, he wrote:

The hour has come to go a stage further and restore the Olympiad<sup>46</sup> to its pristine beauty. At the time of the splendour of Olympia . . . Arts and Letters, harmoniously combined with sport, ensured the grandeur of the Olympic Games.<sup>47</sup>



Coubertin believed that cultural events, performed as part of the Games ceremonies and concurrent with the competitions, would improve the attitudes of all concerned: " . . . an alliance [must] be concluded between athletes, artists and spectators."<sup>48</sup> The existence of poetry, art, and music in conjunction with the Games would "tone down the exceptional and technical aspect of present-day athletics . . . [and the artists would find] . . . forgotten sources of nobility and beauty."<sup>49</sup> Coubertin suggested that in the early years of the competition many of the artists might well be athletes themselves, as this "marriage of muscle and mind," being dead for so long, would not be accepted immediately, particularly in the art world. This was not a weakness, but only a necessary step toward the stable reunion of "brain and brawn":

No doubt at the outset they will only tempt artists and writers who are personally given to the practice of sports. Even the sculptor, if he is to interpret well the muscular tempest which effort arouses in the body of the athlete, should have felt something of the sort in his own body should he not?<sup>50</sup>

It was no accident that the athletic program of the revived Olympic Games was well established before the cultural aspects were included. There was no question in Coubertin's mind but that athletics held the premier position and had to be firmly based before art was introduced and allowed to develop. The rationale underlying this decision was made explicit by the Baron:

Ancient Olympia was a city of athletics, art and prayer. It is a mistake to reverse the order of these three terms, as is sometimes done. The sacred and aesthetic character of Olympia were consequences of its muscular role.<sup>51</sup>

Regardless of the leading position of athletics, the values would move in both directions. In 1906, this was clearly pronounced in Coubertin's



"Opening Address to the consultative Conference of Arts, Letters, and Sports" when he informed the delegates that their objective was to study:

. . . to what extent and in what form the Arts and Letters could take part in the celebration of the modern Olympiads, and in general associate themselves with the practice of sports in order to benefit from them and ennoble them. <sup>52</sup>

The presentation to the world of the doctrine of Olympism came a step closer to completion in 1912 when, for the first time, competitions in arts and letters were included in the Olympic Games. With this addition, Olympism became a unified philosophy using the Games to celebrate its creed. The only task remaining to Coubertin was to convince the world to accept Olympism with the devotion usually reserved for structured religions.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

<sup>1</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympique Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1967), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, cited in *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique*, Marie-Thérèse Eyquem (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), p. 271.

<sup>3</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Aix-en-Provence: Paul Roubaud, 1931), p. 107; see also Marie-Thérèse Eyquem, *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), pp. 271, 273.

<sup>4</sup>Eyquem, p. 271.

<sup>5</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Prague, 1925" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1925), p. 4.

The compilations of the Minutes of the sessions or meetings of the I.O.C. General Assembly found in the Library at the I.O.C. headquarters in Lausanne have various titles. So also have the printed reports of the Minutes in the official organ of the I.O.C. Thus, all Minutes of the I.O.C. sessions will be referred to by a single title, followed by the site of the meeting, and the year, that is, "Minutes of the General Assembly: Prague, 1925." When identical information has been more clearly expressed, or has been translated from the French in the I.O.C. journal report, the published source will be cited, that is, "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1966" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1966), as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 79-80.

<sup>6</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*,

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Eyquem, p. 272.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 273.

<sup>10</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, cited in *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques*, Otto Mayer (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 53.

<sup>11</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 74.



<sup>12</sup>[I.O.C.] *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 1

<sup>13</sup>Coubertin, cited in Eyquem, p. 273.

<sup>14</sup>The early amateur statements that appeared in the Olympic Rules and Regulations gave the power of setting the qualifications to the I.F.s. This delegation of jurisdiction remained in force until the decisions of the Congress of Prague in 1925 limited some of the freedom of the I.F.s by placing certain amateur restrictions in the Olympic rules.

<sup>15</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 70.

<sup>16</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, Frontispiece.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 131.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 132.

<sup>21</sup>E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (1930; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), p. 59.

<sup>22</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 71.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 123.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 79.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>26</sup>Henry Newbolt, "Vitai Lampada," in *Physical Education in England Since 1800*, Peter C. McIntosh (London: Bell and Sons, 1968), pp. 68-69.

<sup>27</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 113.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 129.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 19.



<sup>33</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 11.

<sup>34</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 134.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>36</sup>William Milligan Sloane, "The Olympic Idea," *The Century Magazine*, 84 (July, 1912), 409.

<sup>37</sup>Bill Henry, *An Approved History of the Olympic Games* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1948), p. 12.

<sup>38</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 132.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>42</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 39.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 152-153.

<sup>44</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 9.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>46</sup>A common error is referring to the Olympic Games as the "Olympiad," (for example, "The Montreal Olympiad"). An "Olympiad" is the four-year period of time separating the actual Games festivals, with the Olympic Games being the event celebrated in the first year. Even Coubertin committed the error, in spite of the fact that in 1929 he criticized such mistakes in usage.

<sup>47</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, "Arts, Letters and Sport," *Cultures*, 1(2), UNESCO and la Baconnière (1973), 163.

<sup>48</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 17.

<sup>49</sup>Coubertin, *Cultures*, p. 164.

<sup>50</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 17.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 16.



## CHAPTER 4

### OLYMPISM AS "RELIGION"

The totality of Olympism was looked upon by Coubertin as religion, although outsiders would probably term it "quasi-religion." In 1935, two years before his death, he explained why he thought this atmosphere necessary:

The first essential characteristic of ancient and of modern Olympism alike is that of being a religion. By chiselling his body with exercise as a sculptor chisels a statue the athlete of antiquity was "honouring the gods." In doing likewise the modern athlete exalts his country, his race, his flag. I therefore think I was right to recreate from the outset, around the renewed Olympism, a religious sentiment transformed and widened by the Internationalism and Democracy which distinguish the present age, but still the same as that which led the young Greeks, ambitious for the triumph of their muscles, to the foot of altars of ZEUS.<sup>1</sup>

But what did he mean by "religion"? In an unpublished letter, Coubertin adopted the word "in its most general sense, not as faith in a structured form of divine reality but as adhesion to *an ideal of a superior life of aspiration to perfection.*"<sup>2</sup>

Such a religious aura was almost necessary to support the lofty aims Coubertin had for Olympism. If sport participation were to produce the great personal and international benefits of which he deemed it capable, the Olympic Games needed a special environment. To some degree the editors of *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays* (a compilation of Coubertin's writings on the Olympic Games) have captured Coubertin's image of the "religion of athletics" in this passage:

. . . the frequently misunderstood idea of the "religio athletae" embodied concepts of spiritual preparedness, deep inner feeling and





devotion to something reaching beyond oneself.<sup>3</sup>

In the early years, Coubertin did not actively press his theories of the religious character that he perceived in Olympism, although the theme was discernible in his writings. However, comments he made when looking back to the time of the inception of the modern Olympic Games accentuated his intent that Olympism and the Games should have a religious lustre:

Our object in reviving an institution twenty-five centuries old was that you [youth of the world] should become new adepts of the religion of sports, as our great ancestors conceived it.

Like the athletics of antiquity, modern athletics is a religion, a cult, an impassioned soaring which is capable of going from "play to heroism."<sup>4</sup>

This reference to the athletics of antiquity could well be the source of Coubertin's religious dedication. Even before the first recorded Olympic Games of 776 B.C., Greek athletics had been associated with religious observances.<sup>5</sup> The close connection between all facets of Greek life which Coubertin felt led to a wholeness of man was the quality he tried to revive in modern Olympism. The ceremonies of the modern Games were the manifestations through which Coubertin attempted to display his vision of the Olympic Games as an event with a significance outreaching that of an ordinary world championship.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4

<sup>1</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 131.

<sup>2</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, cited in *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique*, Marie-Thérèse Eyquem (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), p. 268.

<sup>3</sup>Liselott Diem, "Introduction," *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, Pierre de Coubertin, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. VII.

<sup>4</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, pp. 100, 118.

<sup>5</sup>E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 3.



## CHAPTER 5

### SYMBOLS AND TRADITIONS OF OLYMPISM

Although the total philosophy of Olympism is relatively unknown in the world, many of its representative symbols and traditions have become famous because of their use during each Olympic Games festival. These items include: the Olympic motto, the Olympic flag, the oath of the athletes, the Olympic village, the Olympic torch relay, and the ceremonies of the Games. The first three features were chosen or created by Coubertin; the Olympic village and torch relay were established by the organizing committees of the Games in which they first appeared; and the ceremonies incorporated ideas of Coubertin and others, conceived and developed over a period of some years.

#### The Olympic Motto

The motto of the Olympic Games, *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, is the oldest of the Olympic symbols and was not originated by Coubertin. Reports vary in details but all agree that the phrase was used by Father Didon of Arcueil School near Paris. Didon was an ardent believer in sports for educational ends, and in a speech to his students, he emotionally exclaimed, "Here is your motto: *Citius, Altius, Fortius!* Ever Faster, Higher, Stronger!"<sup>1</sup>

Coubertin evidently selected the phrase as the motto for the Congress of Paris. Certainly the words were printed on the masthead of the first issue of the *Bulletin of the International Committee for the*



*Olympic Games*, published in July, 1894. This issue carried a description of the banquet events closing the Congress of Paris, and quoted Michael Breal, the innovator of the "Marathon" race, using the phrase. After presenting a toast to Coubertin, Breal "eloquently paraphrased the famous athletic device expressed by Father Didon and adopted by the Congress; *citius, fortius, altius*; plus vite, plus fort, plus haut."<sup>2</sup> Since then, the sequence of the second and third words has been transposed, resulting in the slogan as it stands today.

### The Olympic Flag

Coubertin's most renowned creation is the Olympic flag (Fig. 1). Composed of five coloured rings on a white ground, the flag was designed to demonstrate the internationalism of the Olympic Movement. Coubertin explained the symbolism in this manner:

These five rings, blue, yellow, black, green and red, represent the five parts of the world which from now on belong to the Olympic Movement and which are ready to accept the fruitful rivalry it entails. In addition, the combination of six colours, (counting the white background) represents every nation without exception. . . . A truly international emblem.<sup>3</sup>

The earliest official exhibitions of the flag were apparently in honour of the twentieth anniversary of the re-establishment of the Olympic Games. It was flown in Alexandria, Egypt on April 5, 1914 and presented two months later at the I.O.C. session in Paris.<sup>4</sup> The flag flew for the second time at the San Francisco Exhibition in March, 1915 and again at the 1919 I.O.C. meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland. Because the 1916 Games were cancelled due to the war, the flag was not hoisted at an Olympic Games festival until that of 1920 at Antwerp.<sup>5</sup> Coubertin ordered the flag constructed to his specifications at the Bon Marche







Fig. 1 The Olympic Flag



store in Paris.<sup>6</sup> In 1914, Coubertin gave the original flag to A. Bolanaki, the member of the I.O.C. for Egypt. It was returned to the I.O.C. in 1959<sup>7</sup> and now hangs on the Library wall at Château de Vidy (I.O.C. headquarters) in Lausanne. Two dates have been embroidered under the rings of the original flag: 1894, the year of the re-establishment of the Olympic Games, and 1925, the year of Coubertin's resignation from the I.O.C.

### The Olympic Oath

In the minds of many, the next brainchild of Coubertin, "the oath of the athletes," was infamous rather than renowned. He saw the oath in two guises: it would deepen the religious aspects of the Olympic Games, and it would combat the "forces of corruption." In a letter written in 1906, Coubertin expounded his views on the religious dimension of the proposed oath:

The true religion of the athlete of antiquity . . . consisted in taking an oath of honour and disinterest, and above all in striving to keep it strictly. A participant in the Games must be in some manner purified by the profession and practice of such virtues.<sup>8</sup>

At that time, Coubertin felt the "forces of corruption" were already beginning to "wreak their evil work." In the same letter, he continued:

. . . the direct receipt of cash prizes, or the resale of objects d'art result in such a confusion of categories that the titles of amateur and professional have become empty of significance. If we let matters slide, a repulsive snobbery, the habit of lying, and the spirit of lucre will invade our groupings.<sup>9</sup>

Coubertin advocated a dual attack by a "more intelligent, broader, and above all more exact definition of the amateur; [and] the restoration of the preliminary oath."<sup>10</sup> He was convinced that the result of such



action would introduce into modern sport "the spirit of gay candor, the spirit of sincere disinterestedness which will revitalize and make collective muscular exercise a true school of moral perfection."<sup>11</sup> Today's Olympic critics would be dumbfounded by Coubertin's faith that the institution of the oath would in any way deter the "habit of lying." To the contrary, contemporary analysts contend this oath contributes to the hypocrisy they feel is so evident in the Olympic Games.

Little data are to be found on the history of the Olympic oath. Coubertin's 1906 letter closed by intimating that he was working on the suggested "programme of moral purification . . . whose details I think we shall soon be able to codify in formulae of practical applicability."<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, not until the 1920 Games at Antwerp was the oath of the athletes first pronounced (by Victor Boin) in the name of all the competitors,<sup>13</sup> and it did not appear as a requirement in the *Olympic Rules and Regulations* until 1921. The protocol for the opening ceremony established the wording of the oath:

*We swear that we will take part in the Olympic Games as loyal competitors, respecting the rules which govern them and desirous of participating in a spirit of chivalry for the honour of our country and the glory of sport.*<sup>14</sup>

(The 1927 English translation replaced "spirit of chivalry" with "true spirit of sportsmanship.") Whether this was the code Coubertin referred to could not be traced. The version in the 1962 rules reworded the statement to read:

*In the name of all competitors I promise that we will take part in these Olympic Games, respecting and abiding by the rules which govern them, in the true spirit of sportsmanship, for the glory of sport and the honour of our teams.*<sup>15</sup>

It must be remembered that, prior to the Games festival, the athlete and



his N.S.C.B. sign an entry form swearing his compliance with the eligibility code of the Olympic Games. The athlete's N.O.C. then forwards the form to the organizing committee, such action again attesting to the amateur status of the competitor.

### The Olympic Village

The first fully accepted Olympic village for housing the athletes was presented by the Los Angeles Organizing Committee of the Xth Olympic Games in 1932.<sup>16</sup> The athletes' village concept was not a modern development as is so often believed. For the ancient Olympic Games, athletic participants lived together during the period of the supervised training required in the weeks preceding the Games. Until 1932 of the modern cycle of Games, the competitors had lived in hotels or, occasionally, in school dormitories. The idea of setting up special group housing for the athletes first gained attention at Antwerp in 1920, although no arrangements were made for those Games. The organizing committee for the 1924 Games, slated to be held in Paris, reported to the I.O.C. in 1923 that an Olympic village was being prepared.<sup>17</sup> It was to be close to the stadium and to include 100 to 150 two-floor buildings with running water. Each country would have its own dining and reception rooms. There appears to have been some reluctance among the N.O.C.s to commit their teams to using this residence and it was not a successful venture. For the Games of Amsterdam in 1928, some schools had been prepared for the athletes' housing, but it seems that they were not too comfortable.<sup>18</sup> Thus, not until 1932 at Los Angeles did a true Olympic village become a reality. Since then, every Summer Games (except London





in 1948), and many Winter Games have had specially built group housing for the athletes. The physical arrangements have seldom escaped criticism (Berlin, in 1936, being a possible exception).<sup>19</sup> In spite of this, the village concept represented a major effort to encourage friendship among all the athletes and so to promote international understanding. The requirement that an Olympic village must be provided by the organizing committee was not incorporated in the Olympic rules until 1949.<sup>20</sup> The Olympic villages are now an integral part of the Olympic Games, making possible the communication between athletes which is requisite if the internationalism factor of Olympism is to have any opportunity for advancement.

#### The Olympic Torch Relay

Prior to the Olympic Games of Berlin in 1936, a plan was devised to have a torch brought by a series of runners from Olympia, Greece to the city of the Games. The flame was to be lit in the "sacred *altis* of Olympia" and used to ignite a giant urn at the Games stadium. The burning of the "sacred" fire during the Games competition would "unite the modern Olympics with their ancient birthplace . . . ." <sup>21</sup> and would present for all to see a representation of the spirit of Olympism that reigned over the contests. The initiator of the project was Carl Diem of the German Olympic Committee and a member of the Berlin Organizing Committee. He consulted with Jean Ketseas of the Greek Olympic Committee in an attempt to devise a method of lighting the original fire at Olympia. Ketseas referred him to Plutarch's *Lives* (the *Life of Numa Pompilius*), which contained a reference to the "sacred fire" burning at



the temple of Athene Polias.<sup>22</sup> Plutarch noted that when the flame died a new one was created "*by the touch of the pure and immaculate flame of the sun.*"<sup>23</sup> Rekindling the flame was accomplished by holding a piece of wood "in front of the middle of a concave mirror which was exposed to the rays of the sun."<sup>24</sup> It should be pointed out that the temple of Athene Polias was not in Olympia and had nothing to do with the Olympic festival. Drees mentioned sacred fires burning at all altars in the sacred grove,<sup>25</sup> but these were of a purely religious significance. Harris<sup>26</sup> and Gardiner<sup>27</sup> gave no evidence of the existence of Olympic flames. In fact, Harris scorned the idea completely:

. . . the torch, which in antiquity had no connection with Olympia, has been dragged into the Hollywood tushery with which it is considered necessary to open the modern Olympic Games.<sup>28</sup>

Nevertheless, the flame, carried by the hands of thousands of runners to the site of the modern Games, has become one of the most symbolic and spectacular of the modern Olympic traditions, and any historical inaccuracy is not likely to dampen public enthusiasm.

### The Ceremonies of the Games

The opening, closing, and victory ceremonies were originally planned to bring a solemnity and spiritual awareness to the "Olympiad [which] must set itself aside from a simple series of world championships."<sup>29</sup> Coubertin (along with many others)<sup>30</sup> claimed that most of the ceremonies were designed by himself. Unfortunately, little evidence is available to support this contention. In his book *Mémoires Olympiques*, written in 1931, Coubertin described the addition of the flags of Greece, the host country, and the next host country, to the closing



ceremonies in 1924, and noted: "This addition completed, as I wished it, the protocol of the Olympic ceremonial that I had constructed piece by piece and by steps . . . ." <sup>31</sup> In his many speeches Coubertin variously referred to facets of the ceremonies but he did not make definite comments as to their sources.

The content of the ceremonies includes features that may be linked to the ancient rituals but they have been shaped primarily in modern patterns. The first Games at Athens incorporated the official opening statement by the chief of state, the cannon shots, the flight of pigeons, and the singing of the Olympic anthem (composed by the Greek, Samara, for the 1896 Games). <sup>32</sup> Added since then have been the parade of the athletes, the raising of the Olympic flag, and the oath (now called the "promise") of the athletes and judges. The victory and closing ceremonies could not be traced as to the format advocated by Coubertin (with the exception of the above quotation). Certainly he believed that the individual athlete must be personally honoured for his victory. An American winner in the 1896 Games mentioned the raising of the United States flag and the playing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" after his victory, but he made no comment on any actual prize-giving ceremony. <sup>33</sup> However, *Harper's Weekly* reported, "The Olympic Games ended by the conferring of the simple bay wreath to each victor, led up before the King, in the stadium, in the presence of thousands of admiring people of all nations . . . ." <sup>34</sup>

By the year 1921, rules included instructions for the ceremonies. The opening and closing ceremonies were described in a comprehensive manner and were similar to the present format. <sup>35</sup> The victory



ceremony was left to the organizing committee to design, the rules requesting only "that the victors must be presented in person and dressed in sporting garb."<sup>36</sup>

Whatever their sources and whatever their legitimacy as vestiges of ancient ceremony, the symbols of Olympism are recognized around the world. The philosophy they symbolize is largely unheeded.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5

<sup>1</sup>[I.O.C.] "Citius, Altius, Fortius," *Olympic Review*, 28 (January, 1970), 9.

<sup>2</sup>Michael Breal, Speech at the closing banquet, June 23, 1894; *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 3, col. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, cited in *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1972), pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup>Angelo Bolanaki, *Historique du Sport en Egypte, le Stade D'Alexandrie, La Renaissance de L'Olympisme, 1894-1954* (n.p.: n.n., n.d.), facing p. 6. [39-page booklet possibly published by author in Egypt, in 1954.]

<sup>5</sup>[I.O.C.] "The Olympic Flag," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 87 (August, 1964), 46.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.

<sup>8</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 15.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>13</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: The Committee, 1972), p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1921), p. 11.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 1962, p. 31.

<sup>16</sup>Dagoberto Ortensi, "The Olympic Villages and the Gigantism of the Games," *Olympic Review*, 56-57 (May-June, 1972), 272.



- <sup>17</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1923" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1923), p. 16.
- <sup>18</sup>Ortensi, p. 272.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 272-278.
- <sup>20</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, p. 24.
- <sup>21</sup>Jean Ketseas, "The Olympic Torch and its Origin," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 87 (August, 1964), 44.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 44-45.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 44.
- <sup>24</sup>Jean Ketseas, "Letter to the Editor," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 78 (May, 1962), 70.
- <sup>25</sup>Ludwig Drees, *Olympia: Gods, Artists and Athletes* (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 124.
- <sup>26</sup>H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London: Hutchinson, 1964), p. 76; see also H. A. Harris, *Sport in Greece and Rome* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972), pp. 1-283.
- <sup>27</sup>E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (1930; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), pp. 1-246; see also E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London: Macmillan, 1910), pp. 1-533.
- <sup>28</sup>Harris, *Greek Athletes . . .*, p. 76.
- <sup>29</sup>Coubertin, cited in *Olympism*, p. 34.
- <sup>30</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Aix-en-Provence; Paul Roubaud, 1931), p. 195; see also Nadejda Lekarska, *Essays and Studies on Olympic Problems* (Sofia: Medicina i Fizkultura, State Publishing House, 1973), p. 15; Xenophon Leon Messinesi, *A Branch of Wild Olive* (New York: Exposition, 1973), p. 72; Liselott Diem, "The Ceremonies," *The International Olympic Academy: Fourth Session, Aug. 1964, Olympia, Greece* (Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1964), pp. 120-136.
- <sup>31</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 195.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 36.
- <sup>33</sup>James B. Connolly, "The Spirit of the Olympian Games," *The Outing Magazine*, 36 (July, 1900[?]), 103.
- <sup>34</sup>Charles Waldstein, "The Olympian Games at Athens," *Harper's*



*Weekly*, 20 (May 16, 1896), 493.

<sup>35</sup>For procedures of the opening ceremony, victory ceremony, and closing ceremony, see current issue *Olympic Rules and Regulations*.

<sup>36</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1921, p. 11.



PART II

THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE





## CHAPTER 6

### FOUNDATIONS OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES AND THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

#### INTERNATIONAL SPORT BEFORE THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

At the time the Paris Congress re-instituted the Olympic Games in 1894, international sporting competition was rapidly developing into a common occurrence. The Olympic Games of 1896 were far from being the first important competition which involved national sport representation. Activities such as pedestrianism, tennis, football, rowing, cycling, and track events were all expanding in their international competitive aspects during the latter decades of the nineteenth century. The first major international contest was the America's Cup yachting race which began in 1851 and still exists.<sup>1</sup> Individual athletes, as well as teams, travelled far distances for competition. Canadian rowers from New Brunswick journeyed to France to defeat a French crew in 1867,<sup>2</sup> and Ned Hanlan of Toronto was unofficially called a world champion for his international rowing victories achieved in many corners of the world.<sup>3</sup> Interaction between neighbouring countries became almost commonplace. Canadian and American sportsmen were crossing the border in both directions to obtain tougher competition than might be found at home. The desire of other nations to match skills with British athletes was particularly strong because Britain was considered the home of sports. Canadian lacrosse teams toured the British Isles several times in the latter part of the nineteenth century,<sup>4</sup> and as early as 1869, Harvard



and Oxford met in a rowing contest.<sup>5</sup> French and English crews had faced each other in both countries, and an international rowing regatta in 1885 included German and French boats as well as the host Belgians.<sup>6</sup> These international meetings were almost exclusively two-nation affairs where only the one sporting activity was performed.

The young Pierre de Coubertin became a strong advocate of international confrontations on the field of sport. His English-influenced version of pedagogical sport saw such contests as peak tests of the loyalty and comradeship values built during the school-orientated competitive experiences. His vision of sport as a life-time avocation supported the proliferation of adult sport clubs in France along lines already developed in Britain, the U.S.A., and some European countries. Of necessity, all international competition was arranged directly through these sport clubs, since I.F.s were rare before the appearance of the Olympic Games. Indeed, in 1892 Coubertin himself was largely instrumental in bringing England and France together on the football field.<sup>7</sup>

Another type of competition which had a longer history was the "Games" style of contests which included several activities but was usually national in scope. Most of the events were of the kind which today would be placed under the umbrella of "track and field," but occasionally other skills were also presented. The Irish Tailtin Games and the Scottish Highland Games were outstanding examples of this type of sports meet. They both had their origins before the Christian era and, therefore, were contemporary with the ancient Greek Olympic Games.<sup>8</sup> One might well compare the clan rivalries of the early Highland Games



with the city-states factionalism of the Greek Olympics.

The name Olympic had been attached to games in several countries prior to Coubertin selecting it for his sports festival. A meet modeled on medieval contests was so designated by Robert Dover in the Cotswolds of England in 1603.<sup>9</sup> In the second half of the eighteenth century, competitions entitled "Olympic" were held for local young people near Dessau in Germany.<sup>10</sup> Even young Canada presented a track meet at Montreal in 1844 that was called Olympic Games.<sup>11</sup> The Greeks, themselves, attempted to bring the glories of ancient Greece back to life by instituting a series of "Olympic Games" in 1859, holding them again, with varying degrees of success, in 1870, 1875, and 1879.<sup>12</sup> Messinesi claimed that patterns set for these Olympics may have influenced the eventual modern Olympic Games. For instance, in the Greek games three placings were recognized, the competitors swore an oath of "fair play," the King officially opened the games, and trumpeters and heralds announced the victors.<sup>13</sup>

Baron de Coubertin never saw these games because he did not visit Greece until 1894, but he was a spectator in 1890 at another English version of "the Olympian Movement" at Much Wenlock in Shropshire<sup>14</sup> during the period when he was searching for ways to make sport more widely accepted in France.

Although the modern Olympic Games may owe much to these earlier sporting events, Coubertin's creation was unique in two ways. The 1896 Games were the very first multi-sport *and* multi-nation athletic competitions. Also, Coubertin went far beyond any previous ideas when he resurrected the Greek ideal of the development of the whole man as the



"religion" of Olympic sportsmen.

The general lack of success of all these early "Olympic Games" as continuing efforts is attested to by the fact that not one of them existed in the late nineteenth century, at a time when sport competition was spreading so quickly in the Western world.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MODERN OLYMPIC GAMES

Although the 1890's should have been a fertile period during which to plant the seed of Coubertin's Olympic Idea, the Baron's first effort to re-establish the Olympic Games was met with indifference. In 1892, the U.S.F.S.A. convened a conference dealing with sports topics in Paris and Coubertin was one of three distinguished speakers. The Baron strategically designed his speech to develop a climax at which time he would announce the renewal of the ancient Olympic Games. Coubertin's words were germane to the concept of the modern Olympic Games:

Let us export rowers, runners and fencers; there is the free trade of the future, and on the day when it is introduced within the walls of old Europe the cause of peace will have received a new and mighty stay. This is enough to encourage your servant to dream . . . that with you he will be able to continue and complete, on a basis suited to the conditions of modern life, this grandiose and salutary task, the restoration of the Olympic Games.<sup>15</sup>

Before the speech, Coubertin had been justifiably anxious about the reception of his idea, and in 1931 he recalled his apprehension:

Naturally, I had anticipated everything, except what happened. Opposition? Protests? Irony? Or even indifference? Not at all. They applauded, they approved, they wished me great success, but no one had understood.<sup>16</sup>

Years earlier, in 1908, when describing the same events, Coubertin





explained the audience reaction:

They thought I referred to Olympia only as a symbol . . . .  
To them the Olympic Games were placed in the same category as the  
mysteries of Eleusis or the oracle of Delphi; things that were  
dead and could only be revived in a comic opera.<sup>17</sup>

Never a man to give up easily, the Baron immediately began to lay plans for a second assault on the most influential directors of world sport groups in order to attain his purpose of renovating the Olympic Games. In 1893, he and Palliseaux<sup>18</sup> convinced the U.S.F.S.A. to present an international congress to discuss the problem of amateurism in sport. Three men were named as commissioners to prepare the congress: Coubertin for France and Europe, C. Herbert (president of the British Amateur Athletic Association) for Britain and the colonies, and M. Sloane (Princeton history professor and sportsman) for the Americas.<sup>19</sup> Although Coubertin visited Sloane in November of 1893, and Herbert in February, 1894,<sup>20</sup> to consult on the planning, the load of the organizing responsibility fell on the Baron as he was on the scene in Paris. This could very well have been part of Coubertin's strategy. In later years he admitted that the amateur motif was merely a "screen"<sup>21</sup> for his prime purpose--to present again the idea of re-establishing the Olympic Games. The fact that his fellow administrators lived in foreign countries left him a wide-open field for designing the congress to enhance his "pet project." His selection of location, choice of patrons and speakers, wording of invitations, and arrangement of cultural and festive events was carefully contrived, not to solve the difficulties of amateur and professional attitudes, but to create a milieu conducive to the acceptance of his Olympic dream.



The initial invitation, distributed as notice of the impending congress, was circulated in the fall of 1893 and contained seven agenda items relating directly to amateurism, and an eighth point pertaining to the renovation of the Olympic Games. In January, 1894, a second program was printed to which were added two more questions on Olympic Games organization. These three points were presented to the congress:

#### Olympic Games

- VIII. Possibility of their re-establishment. - Advantages from the athletic, moral and international point of view.
- IX. Conditions to impose on the competitors. - Sports represented - Material organization, periodicity of restored Olympic Games, etc.
- X. Nomination of an International Committee charged with preparing their restoration.<sup>22</sup>

The often-made charge that Coubertin "slipped" these items onto the agenda at the last moment is patently false, as the second program was produced well in advance of the congress.<sup>23</sup> However, it can be agreed that Coubertin substituted the objective by expanding the Olympic Games topic and influenced the focus of the meetings by altering the title of the gathering to "Congress for the Re-establishment of the Olympic Games."<sup>24</sup>

The opening plenary session divided into two groups: one to develop an amateur definition, and the other to study the Olympic Games proposal. The existing Minutes of the two meetings of the "Olympic Games Commission" (as the second group was called) on June 19 and 21 included the secretary's notes for proposing the recommendations to the final plenary session on June 23, 1894. Although no Minutes of the plenary sessions appear to exist, all available reports stated that the



following proposals of the Olympic Games Commission were accepted unanimously and without discussion:<sup>25</sup>

- VIII. As no doubt can exist on the advantages presented by the re-establishment of the Olympic Games from the athletic, moral and international point of view, these Games will be re-established on the bases and in the conditions conforming to the necessities of modern life.
- IX. That Olympic competitions will be organized only for amateurs except for fencing.
- X. That the International Committee charged with the organization of the Olympic Games introduce in its regulations a clause which gives the right to exclude from competition all persons who, by their previous actions, could bring harm to the esteem of the institution.
- XI. That no country has the right to be represented in the Olympic Games by other than its nationals and that, in each country, eliminations must be held previous to the Games to designate, for participation, true champions in each type of sport.
- XII. That the following sports be represented in the Olympic Games if possible:
  - Athletic sports (races and competition)
  - Aquatics (rowing, sailing and swimming)
  - Athletic Games (football, lawn-tennis, "paume," etc.)
  - Skating
  - Fencing, Boxing, Wrestling
  - Equestrian sports, Polo
  - Shooting and Gymnastics
  - Cycling

As part of the Athletic Sports a general athletic championship under the name of "Pentathlon" will be instituted.

Also, on the occasion of the Olympic Games, an Alpinism prize will be given for the most interesting climb anywhere in the world since the last competitions.

- XIII. That the Olympic Games will take place the first time in Athens in 1896, and for the second time in Paris in 1900, and subsequently every four years in other cities of the world.
- XIV. That, the Olympic Games being able to succeed only with the support of governments, the International Committee must take all necessary steps toward the public authorities in order to assure their official co-operation.<sup>26</sup>



Despite Article XIII, the suggestion that Athens hold the first Games was not a proposal of the Olympic Games Commission. In fact, tales of how this came about are as numerous as the people recounting the event. For example, Mandell implied that the choice of Athens was an impulsive decision made under the emotional influence of the closing banquet on June 23.<sup>27</sup> However, the June 19 Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission clearly showed that Athens was recommended by Coubertin that early in the proceedings.<sup>28</sup> Actually, Coubertin had foreseen the Games beginning at Paris in 1900, and had published this opinion in the *Review of Paris*, June 15, 1894.<sup>29</sup> The aura of harmony and concord generated by the brilliance of the opening ceremonies at the Sorbonne not only convinced Coubertin that his vision would be realized, but encouraged him to advance the inception of the Games to 1396. He and D. Vikelas, the Greek delegate, conferred as to the possibility of Athens hosting the Games, with the result that, "we resolved, he and I, to propose Athens as the initial site."<sup>30</sup> Several of the commission members spoke strongly in favour of London as the site for the first Games, but, as no one from England was present, the Olympic Games Commission postponed the selection until later.<sup>31</sup> Subsequent Minutes did not mention the subject again, but obviously the matter was raised at the plenary session and Athens was awarded the first Olympic Games of the modern era.<sup>32</sup>

During the same plenary session additional decisions were made and were ultimately carried out, but no written record of them could be found. The resolutions passed by the Congress of Paris on June 23, 1894 referred to an "International Committee" charged to organize the





Games.<sup>33</sup> Absolutely no documentation could be located as to when, or how, the word sequence "International Olympic Committee" was settled. Specific names of potential members were not included in the Olympic Games Commission Minutes and there were no official records of the congress. Coubertin conceded, "I had full liberty in the composition of the I.O.C. The list proposed was elected without alteration."<sup>34</sup> When this was written in 1931, his memory must have told him that the candidates' names had been put forward to the congress and accepted, but no other document of proof could be found. Coubertin listed the favoured gentlemen:

Vikelas for Greece; Callot and I for France; General de Boutowsky for Russia; Colonel Balck for Sweden; Prof. Sloane for the U.S.A.; Jiri Guth[-Jarkovsky] (Bohemia); Fr. Kemény (Hungary); C. Herbert and Lord Amthill for England; Prof. Zubiaur for Argentina and L. A. Cuff for New Zealand; finally Count Lucchesi Palli accepted provisionally for Italy and soon after Count Max de Bousies for Belgium.<sup>35</sup>

The official *Olympic Directory* (1973) of the I.O.C.<sup>36</sup> and Otto Mayer<sup>37</sup> included the name of Duc d'Andria Carafa as being an original member of the I.O.C. However, the *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games* (October, 1894) reported that Palli declined because his diplomatic functions required him to be abroad, and Carafa was named in his place.<sup>38</sup>

#### FIRST MEETING (UNOFFICIAL) OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

The construction of the philosophical and operational framework of the I.O.C. apparently was left to the members. Accordingly, a few days after the congress terminated, Coubertin and a few others met at Vikelas's Paris home to fashion the I.O.C.<sup>39</sup> The most important



decision of that day, and one that has seldom been free from attack since, was the acceptance by this group of Coubertin's "self-recruiting body" concept of I.O.C. membership "in the style of the direction of the Henley Regatta."<sup>40</sup> This decision meant that the members would owe their first allegiance to the I.O.C. and to the Olympic Games, not to some sport or government they represented. The Baron envisaged a completely independent band of sportsmen dedicated to the perpetuation of his Olympic Ideal through the Olympic Games. However, even in 1894, Coubertin was aware that while his I.O.C. members would vary in their degree of devotion to the cause all would have a role to play:

- It [I.O.C.] must be composed of three concentric circles:
- a small nucleus of working members, competent and convinced
  - a preparatory school of members of goodwill that can be progressively trained
  - a façade of titled gentlemen, wealthy or important, whose presence gives satisfaction to certain national pretensions and assures prestige to the assembly.<sup>41</sup>

Demetrius Vikelas assumed the leadership of the I.O.C. at the meeting, fulfilling Coubertin's intention that the presidency should be mobile and occupied every four years by a member who was a citizen of the country hosting the next Games. This pattern was short-lived, as Coubertin, who became president in 1896, was re-confirmed in the position until 1925 when he was allowed to resign by the reluctant members.

During Vikelas's period of tenure, Coubertin happily served as secretary-general as he claimed the position was "more interesting than most presidencies because it is the mainspring of an active administration."<sup>42</sup> This role of active administrator allowed Coubertin to control the direction of the venture. Mayer noted that Coubertin "declared frankly that he wished freedom of action for the introductory



period believing there would be efforts to modify the direction of the movement he had created."<sup>43</sup>

Although in later years the members of the I.O.C. have called attention to the original "Charter" of the Olympic Games which supposedly was constructed in 1894, the decisions made at the Congress of Paris and at the unofficial meeting at the Vikelas's residence were not then formulated into concise statements and committed to print. Mayer summed up the initiatory meetings:

. . . during the first weeks following the Congress of 1894, the bases of Olympism were fixed: absolute independence of the members of the I.O.C. relative to nations or sport movements; refusal to admit delegates . . . ; absolute equality of sports in spite of some inclinations for domination by athletics.<sup>44</sup>

These points, plus the decisions of the Congress of Paris, eventually were shaped into the first printed *Olympic Rules and Regulations* of 1908.

#### EVOLUTION OF THE OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS

An institution such as the Olympic Games cannot exist for eighty years without change occurring. Nevertheless, the basic tenets sustaining the Olympic Movement have undergone only minor alterations since 1894. Certainly the attitudes of the succeeding members, as evidenced by the I.O.C. Minutes, have been surprisingly congruent with the beliefs of the original committee. Alteration, therefore, has been a case of attempting to clarify positions rather than transforming the basic ideologies. The result has been an augmentation of guiding statements and not any great re-direction of purpose or method in response to changing situations. The declarations of the I.O.C. expounding its



doctrines have moved from simplicity to complexity without affecting the reflection of its creed. Few guidelines appear to have been committed to print until the 1908 *Olympic Rules and Regulations* which were brief in the extreme. In 1920, a statement on amateur status was included in the rules and from that time onward the dictums of the I.O.C. have proliferated until today a booklet of sixty pages is required to enumerate the Olympic protocol. For the most part, the expanded material simply put into written format the precepts previously held but not published.

Objects and Powers of the International  
Olympic Committee

The central intent supporting the institution of the I.O.C. stands today much more clearly defined and extended than in 1894 but relatively unchanged in spirit. The Congress of Paris charged the neophyte committee with Olympic Games organization and conveyed little guidance for the development of standards and controls. No explicit statement exists of goals or objectives of the I.O.C. as they might have been agreed upon and proclaimed by the group which met at Vikelas's home. However, in 1908 the following appeared as the first section of the rules and regulations:

Goal

. . . . .

- 1. To ensure the regular celebrations of the Games;
- 2. To make this celebration more and more perfect, worthy of its glorious past and conforming with the high ideals which inspired its renovators;
- 3. To organize all the manifestations and, in general, to take all proper measures to direct modern sport in desirable pathways.<sup>45</sup>

These statements stood unchanged until 1949, except for slight





alterations in wording, probably as a result of new translations into English. That year, the text embodied the revision of Rules 2 and 3:

Second: making them more worthy of their glorious history and of the high ideals which inspired Baron Pierre de Coubertin and his associates to revive the Games.

Third: encouraging the organization of sports competitions generally and to guide, influence and lead amateur sport in the right lines.<sup>46</sup>

In 1955, another re-writing resulted in slight editorializing of Rules 1 and 2, and split Rule 3 into two parts:

Third: encouraging the organization of sports competitions.

Fourth: guiding, influencing and leading amateur sport in the right lines.<sup>47</sup>

A year later more modifications were made: Rule 3 merely had the word "amateur" inserted before "sport competitions," probably to correct the omission made in the previous change, but Rule 4 was extended to express the internationalism Coubertin and the committee had always intended:

4. guiding, and leading amateur sport along the right lines, thereby promoting and strengthening friendship between the sportsmen of all countries.<sup>48</sup>

It was not until 1971 that further change occurred and, again, Rule 4 was the focus of attention. Although Coubertin had referred to the "Olympic Idea" in his speech at the closing banquet of the Congress of Paris, the words had never been incorporated in the "Goals" or "Objects and Powers" (as they were latterly called) of the I.O.C. This neglect was remedied by causing Rule 4 to read:

4. Inspiring and leading sport within the Olympic ideal, thereby promoting and strengthening friendship between the sportsmen of all countries.<sup>49</sup>

These, then, were the "Objects and Powers" of the I.O.C. in its



continuing efforts to control and develop the Olympic Movement.

### Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Rules and Regulations

Whereas the foregoing "Objects and Powers" seemingly dealt with the broad intentions of the I.O.C. relative to the total Olympic Movement, the "Fundamental Principles" which evolved were concerned more with the Games *per se*. In the beginning, these principles were quite simple and straightforward, but as the Games gained recognition and reached more of the world's sportsmen, and as the tendency increased to use the Games for political purposes, greater definition was required.

The earliest of these principles was a series of statements, added in 1920 to the brief 1908 rules, under the heading "Regulations Relative to the Celebration of the Olympiads":

1. The Olympic Games assemble ~~amateurs~~ of all nations under conditions as equal as possible.
2. They are celebrated every four years. An Olympiad need not be celebrated but neither the order nor the intervals can be altered.
3. The International Committee designates the place of the celebration of each Olympiad.
4. To be qualified to participate in the Games one must be a native of a country or naturalized subject of that country and also an amateur recognized by the Olympic Committee of their respective country and of an uncontested honourability.
5. To be considered as a recognized National Committee the Olympic Committee must be constituted by the member(s) of the International Committee for the country in question or in agreement with them. The recognition exists as long as the agreement between them. If they inform the International Committee that the agreement no longer exists the recognition ceases *ipso facto*.
6. The Olympic Games must include the following categories: Athletics, gymnastics, combat sports, aquatics, equestrian sports, Pentathlon, etc. . . . 50



In 1923 a section entitled "Charter of the Olympic Games" with the sub-heading "Fundamental Principles" was introduced. The foregoing information from the 1920 publication was now contained under the new sub-heading. Rule 5 was completely eliminated and "art competitions" was added to Rule 6; otherwise, only editorial changes were made.

By 1927 the Olympic Winter Games cycle had been instituted and, consequently, two new clauses were interjected as Rules 5 and 6:

5. There is a distinct Cycle of Olympic Winter Games which is celebrated in the same year as the other Games. Starting from the VIIIth Olympiad they take the title of First Olympic Winter Games but the term Olympiad will not be used to describe them.
6. The International Olympic Committee chooses the place for the celebration of the Olympic Winter Games giving the first refusal to the country holding the current Olympic Games on condition that they can give sufficient guarantees to organize both Games at the same time.<sup>51</sup>

Major amendments in terminology were made in 1949, and new ideas were incorporated, while some of the previous declarations were removed:

1. The Olympic Games are held every four years and assemble amateurs of all nations in fair and equal competition under conditions which are to be as perfect as possible. No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of colour, religion or politics.
2. The Olympic Games celebrate an Olympiad or period of four successive years. The first Olympiad of modern times was celebrated in Athens in 1896, and subsequent Olympiads and Games are numbered consecutively from that year, even though it has been or may be impossible to hold the Games in any Olympiad.
3. The direction of the Olympic movement and the regulation of the Olympic Summer and the Winter Games throughout the world is vested in the International Olympic Committee whose constitution and powers are defined in these Rules. The honour of holding the Olympic Games is entrusted to a city and not to a country. The choice of a city for the celebration of an Olympiad lies solely with the International Olympic Committee. Applications to hold the Games are made by the Mayor or other chief authority of the city concerned and must be accompanied



by adequate guarantees that the Games will be organized to the satisfaction and the requirements of the International Olympic Committee.

4. The Olympic Games necessarily include in their programme the following events:  
Athletics, Gymnastics, Combative Sports, Aquatic Sports, Equestrian Sports, Modern Pentathlon and Art Exhibitions. These events are further defined in Rule 42 of these Rules.
5. A separate cycle of Winter Games is held, comprising competition in Winter Sports. The Winter Games are held in the same calendar year as the Olympic Games. The first Winter Games were held in 1924 during the VIIth Olympiad and subsequent Winter Games are numbered in rotation as they are held. The term Olympiad is not used in connection with the Winter Games.
6. Only nationals of a country are qualified to compete for that country in the Olympic Games.
7. Only persons who are amateurs, within the definition laid down in these Rules may compete in the Olympic Games.
8. All profits and funds derived from the holding of the Olympic Games (after payment of all proper expenses in connection with their organization and of any contribution to the funds of the International Olympic Committee) are paid to the National Olympic Committee of the country holding the Games and are necessarily applied for the promotion of the Olympic movement or the development of amateur sport.<sup>52</sup>

In 1955, the word "nationals" was replaced by "citizens" in Rule 6, possibly to assure all the displaced persons after World War II that obtaining citizenship in their new country would allow Olympic qualification. The same rule added the sentence "The Games are contests between individuals and not between nations,"<sup>53</sup> apparently in an attempt to diminish the growing emphasis on nationalism.

An odd change was made in 1956: the sequence of Rules 6 and 7 (of the 1955 version) was reversed, and the word "countries" substituted for "nations" in Rule 6, but otherwise the whole section was repeated as before.<sup>54</sup> The transposition may have been a preliminary





effort to indicate the importance of amateurism as a factor of entry qualification.

Rule 4, which previously had dealt with the required sports for the Games, was deleted from the "Fundamental Principles," in 1958, and was replaced with a new item of drastically different content:

4. The aims of the Olympic Movement are to promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities that come from contests on the friendly fields of amateur sport and to bring together the youth of the world in a great quadrennial sport festival, thereby creating international respect and goodwill, and helping to construct a better and more peaceful world.<sup>55</sup>

Also, the regulation requiring amateur status now referred the reader to Rule 26 for the definition of an amateur. This rule has become so famous that, since then, it has been referred to simply as "Rule 26."

By 1962 importance was again being attached to the sequence of the rules. Evidently the importance of the regulation as a principle of the Olympic Games was determined by its numerical rank. The item added in 1958 was moved from fourth to third position in the 1962 edition of the rules and regulations. An addition of considerable philosophical interest was made in a footnote to Rule 7: "The Games are contests between individuals and not between countries." The notation proclaimed:

Since the Olympic Movement is non-political, the words "country" or "nation" are in these rules intended to apply also to a geographical area, district or territory within the limits of which an Olympic Committee recognized by the International Olympic Committee functions or operates.<sup>56</sup>

One might conjecture that this broad interpretation was precipitated by the number of "countries" which were split into two parts following World War II. The problems encountered by the I.O.C. with respect to



recognition of two Germanys and two Chinas likely necessitated qualification of the meaning of the words "country" and "nation."

The footnote to Rule 7 was expanded in the 1966 publication in a further attempt to reduce any possible political involvement of the I.O.C. Whether or not it has succeeded is highly questionable, and, indeed, in some respects it seems to be contradictory:

Recognition of an Olympic Committee in such an area:

1. does not imply political recognition, as this is outside the competence of the International Olympic Committee;
2. is dependent on the area having had a stable Government for a reasonable period.<sup>57</sup>

Further adjustment dealing with political refutation occurred in 1971 when the old Rule 7 concerning citizenship was divided to make two rules, with the earlier footnote incorporated into the new item:

7. Only Citizens of a country or area in which a National Olympic Committee recognized by the I.O.C. operates, are qualified to participate in the Olympic Games under the colours of that country or area.

Recognition of a National Olympic Committee in such a country or area:

1. Does not imply political recognition.
2. Is dependent on the country or area having had a stable government for a reasonable period.
8. The Games are contests between individuals and not between countries or areas.<sup>58</sup>

Comments on Changes in "Objects and Powers of the I.O.C." and in "Fundamental Principles" of the Olympic Rules and Regulations

This overview of the authorized pronouncements of the I.O.C. is indicative of the trend taken by the thoughts of its members over the years. The differentiation between "Objects and Powers" and "Fundamental



Principles" often seems cloudy and the elimination of some rules and inclusion of new ones does little to reduce the confusion. Ignoring the semantics problem, it is possible to follow the general development of the basic tenets of the Olympic Movement. The most outstanding characteristic of the rule changes is the increasingly wide area of endeavour included in the I.O.C.'s self-designated mandate. The incorporation of the "Fundamental Principles" in 1920 (even under a different heading) presented concerns over which the I.O.C. had control from the beginning but which had not previously been stated. This may be true of all the succeeding adjustments and conditions. Some rules were not totally deleted but were shifted to other sections of the treatise.

Overall, the I.O.C. apparently experienced a tremendous sense of growing prestige and power. Comparison of the early statements with those of 1971 indicates an increase in its appreciation of internationalism; sensitivity to political involvement; awareness of Olympism; insistence on amateurism; concern with finance; and attention to detailed explanations.

Although internationalism was integral to Coubertin's great plan for the youth of the world, it was not until 1956 that international relationships of competitors was stressed. The 1908 "Goal" pointed directly to the presentation of the Olympic Games as the focus of I.O.C. activity. By 1971 it felt responsible for the role of all amateur sport in cementing friendly relations between sportsmen of all countries.

The non-political stance of the I.O.C. was not voiced in the Fundamental Principles until 1962. This does not mean the I.O.C. was not concerned with the problem until that time, but rather that the



persistence of political issues had reached a level requiring an official reminder. Certainly the political aspects of the 1936 Berlin Games had led to world-wide apprehension. Other political incidents were far from being isolated cases. One can also conjecture that the rising predominance of the U.S.S.R. and the "eastern bloc" nations in world sport motivated the addition of the cautionary footnote in 1962.

It is surprising to observe that mention of the Olympic Ideal does not appear until 1971 under Objects and Powers. The terminology "Olympic Movement" was used under Fundamental Principles for the first time in 1949, but that is an ambiguous expression which is widely misunderstood today, and there is little reason to expect it was more meaningful in 1949 or earlier. Equally astounding to note is that the connection of the words "Olympic Movement" with a statement outlining ideological aims did not occur in the rules until 1958. Coubertin spent much of his life talking and writing about this very hypothesis, but not until twenty-one years after his death did it materialize in the Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Games. The reason for this latter-day awareness could be due to the idealistic dedication of President Avery Brundage. The emphasis on Olympism and the use of related terms increased noticeably in public utterances during Brundage's reign as president from 1952 to 1972.

Until 1927, the I.O.C. rules did not *define* an amateur (see discussion on amateurism in Chapter 10). The word was used as a qualification for participation, but no interpretation was given. Even in 1927, the definition was not part of the Fundamental Principles. In 1949, the amateur requirement was incorporated into the Fundamental





Principles and made reference to an explanation to be found elsewhere in the rules. That explanation, under the heading "General Rules Applicable to the Celebration of the Olympic Games" (sub-headed "Necessary Conditions for Representing a Country"), was the one originally devised in 1927 which had become more explicit and categorical as the years passed. When one considers that the fountainhead of confrontations between the I.F.s, the athletes, and the I.O.C. has always rested in the amateur rule, it is thought-provoking to find the lack of emphasis on the topic in the Fundamental Principles of the I.O.C. rules.

Financial problems have plagued the I.O.C. since its inception. This fact makes it all the more curious that no statement outlining the disposition of profits from hosting an Olympic Games appeared until 1949. Certainly a greater percentage of Games held prior to World War II than after it had profits to dispense. However, it is possible that rumours of misuse of surpluses caused the insertion of the rule which insists that extra monies be dedicated to amateur sport promotion.

The greater attention paid to detailed explanations, particularly in the Fundamental Principles, is obviously a result of need. One can almost believe that, in the early years, the I.O.C. was under the misapprehension that the world understood and accepted its unstated dogma--that it was, indeed, united in attitudes to sport values--and the extension of the rules resulted from the gradual realization that this was not, in fact, the case. As the Games blossomed in magnitude and scope, the I.O.C. has been obliged to state its purposes and controls with greater elaboration.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 6

<sup>1</sup>Frederick W. Cozens and Florence Scovill Stumpf, *Sports in American Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 268.

<sup>2</sup>Nancy Howell and Maxwell L. Howell, *Sports and Games in Canadian Life: 1700 to the Present* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1969), p. 118.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 70-72.

<sup>5</sup>John Apostol Lucas, "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896," (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 62.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 63.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 76.

<sup>8</sup>Gerald Redmond, *The Caledonian Games in Nineteenth Century America* (Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, 1971), pp. 24-25.

<sup>9</sup>Xenophon Leon Messinesi, *A Branch of Wild Olive* (New York: Exposition Press, 1973), p. 43.

<sup>10</sup>Walter Leifer, "The Olympic Idea," *Man in Sport*, ed. Karl Bellmer (Munich: Max Hueber, 1972), p. 8.

<sup>11</sup>Peter Leslie Lindsay, "A History of Sport in Canada, 1807-1867" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1969), p. 140.

<sup>12</sup>Messinesi, p. 53.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

<sup>14</sup>Lucas, p. 69.

<sup>15</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 1.

<sup>16</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Aix-en-Provence: Paul Roubaud, 1931), p. 9.

<sup>17</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Une Campagne de Vingt et Un Ans* (Paris: Librairie de L'Education Physique, 1908), p. 90.



<sup>18</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 12.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-16.

<sup>21</sup>Messinesi, p. 62.

<sup>22</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 2, col. 1.

<sup>23</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 20; see also Lucas, p. 105; Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), pp. 19-20; [At the time Mayer's book was published he had been chancellor of the I.O.C. for fourteen years. The book is a report on the business handled at the I.O.C. General Assemblies from 1894 to 1960 inclusive. Mayer has selected from the Minutes those items which he deemed most important or interesting. Since he obviously had access to archival material which was not available to this writer, his book is often cited when the Minutes were insufficient.]; I.O.C. *Bulletin of the International Committee . . .*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>26</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee . . .*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>27</sup>Richard D. Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York: Macmillan 1971), p. 21.

<sup>28</sup>Olympic Games Commission, "Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission [Congress of Paris] June 19, 21, 1894" (Lausanne: The I.O.C., 1894), p. 9.

<sup>29</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 19.

<sup>30</sup>Coubertin, *Une Campagne*, p. 98.

<sup>31</sup>Olympic Games Commission, "Minutes, 1894," p. 9.

<sup>32</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee . . .*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 20.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.



<sup>36</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Directory* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1973), p. 61.

<sup>37</sup>Mayer, pp. 19-20.

<sup>38</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee . . .*, 2 (October, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>39</sup>Mayer, p. 20.

<sup>40</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 23.

<sup>41</sup>Mayer, p. 21.

<sup>42</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 21.

<sup>43</sup>Mayer, p. 20.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>45</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1908), p. 7.

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*, 1949, p. 7.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, 1955, p. 7.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, 1956, p. 11.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 1971, p. 13. [Although printed in 1971, these Rules and Regulations are the result of work done and decisions made in previous years and, therefore, fall within the time limitations of this study.]

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, 1920, pp. 8-9.

<sup>51</sup>I.O.C., "Fundamental Principles," [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 16.

<sup>52</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, pp. 5-6.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 1955, p. 6.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, 1956, pp. 9-10.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 1958, p. 9.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, 1962, p. 6.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 1966, p. 12.





<sup>58</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 12.



## CHAPTER 7

### STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE<sup>1</sup>

#### INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

"As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen."<sup>2</sup> These words of a Christian benediction describe accurately the conditions of membership in the I.O.C. The privileges and responsibilities attending memberships have altered only in minor details between 1894 and 1970. Although no code was set down in the early years, there is no doubt that certain principles were known and accepted by the committee. With two insignificant changes noted below, the characteristics of membership in the I.O.C., whether in 1894 or 1970, have encompassed the following features:

1. Self-recruitment--incumbent members select new members.
2. Autonomy--the I.O.C. is a law unto itself; as a body it is the supreme authority in the field in which it operates.
3. Membership limit--there is no maximum number of members.
4. Reverse representation--the members of the I.O.C. are ambassadors *to* their country of residence, not representatives *of* it on the I.O.C.
5. Independence--the members of the I.O.C. must not be influenced by any group or government. They must have absolute independence in all voting and must not consider any factors other than the good of the Olympic Games and



the Olympic Movement.

6. Tenure--membership ceases when:

- a. a member resigns or dies;
- b. a member is dismissed for failing to attend to the work of the I.O.C. over a period of some years, or for betraying its interests;
- c. a member attains the age of 72 years. This is a relatively new rule, effective for members joining after 1965.<sup>3</sup>

7. Nationality--there may be one to three members who reside in the same country. In 1966, this was changed to a maximum of two for countries which are very active in sports or those which have hosted the Olympic Games.<sup>4</sup>

The earliest printed presentation of this information appeared in 1908. The rule dealing with membership was headed "Recruitment" and contained the following:

The International Olympic Committee is permanent and self-recruiting at a rate of at least one member and as many as three for each country represented. The number of countries represented is not limited. The members must consider themselves delegates of the International Olympic Committee to the federations and societies of sport and physical exercise of their respective countries. They can accept no mandate from these societies which would endanger the independence of their votes.

The members of the Committee are elected for an undetermined period. Those, however, can be considered as resigned, who during two whole years have not taken part in any manifestation, meeting, vote, etc.

Deletion [from membership] can be pronounced by the Committee against those of its members who have betrayed its interests or breached laws of honour or decorum.<sup>5</sup>

The cornerstone of the power and influence of the I.O.C. is the



self-perpetuating fashion of the selection of the members. The original committee members were personally chosen by Pierre de Coubertin. From that time onward new members have been recruited by the incumbents. In an address entitled "Trustees of the Olympic Idea" given in 1908, Coubertin explained his views:

. . . the best means of safeguarding liberty and serving democracy is not always to abandon everything to election, but on the contrary to maintain within the broad electoral ocean some islets whereon there may be assured, in certain specialities, the continuity of a stable and independent effort. Independence and stability . . . [are] . . . too frequently the qualities which are lacking in presentday groupings, particularly sporting groupings.<sup>6</sup>

This was precisely the reason why Coubertin instituted his method of co-opting committee members rather than accepting delegates from outside organizations. Potential members usually have been carefully investigated before their names are proposed to the General Assembly. Coubertin was firmly convinced election to membership must be based on the fact that "their viewpoint was an international one and because they were free from economic and political pressure . . . [and also based on] . . . the character of the individual and not the land of his birth."<sup>7</sup>

However, every member has been a man of independent wealth, and this could be considered the best guarantee of the freedoms mentioned. The "reverse representation" interpretation of I.O.C. membership continues to provide the autonomy of the body. With each gentleman supposedly free from responsibilities toward any subordinate group, pressures from below have carried little weight. As the I.O.C. owes no allegiance to a higher power, there has been no superior group to whom it is accountable. In actuality, bias toward national or





sport-related positions has really existed in that some of the I.O.C. members have been closely connected with N.O.C.s or I.F.s. The fact that this is a sporting body makes some background experience with sport desirable. A survey of the members at any point in I.O.C. history reveals a few outstanding ex-athletes and many players. Many of the men first came to the attention of the I.O.C. because of their connection with sport in their own countries. Some I.O.C. members have held important positions with their governments, particularly in the armed forces or diplomatic corps. Although none of these relationships appear to have overtly affected I.O.C. decisions, they surely must have contributed a covert (if not overt) influence.

Stability of the I.O.C. has been attained by the permanence of membership in that there was no "term of office." New members have been added to old, creating an amalgam of "youthful" spirit with seasoned experience.

Coubertin fully expected his elite committee to be attacked and criticized for its lack of democratic selection methods. From first to last he never ceased explaining and defending his theories. In *Mémoires Olympiques* he outlined his attitudes in 1894, "to impose on its [I.O.C.] members, the armour of an absolute independence by refusing access to all 'delegates' . . ."<sup>8</sup> In 1925, at the time of his resignation from the I.O.C., Coubertin reiterated his position:

Modern Olympism has prospered on account of having entrusted its full control to an International Committee, entirely independent, self-supporting, never subsidized by anyone. The very fact that this Committee is self-recruiting makes it immune to all political interference, and it is not swayed by intense nationalism nor influenced by corporative interests.<sup>9</sup>



Over the years many efforts have been made to democratize the I.O.C. by including delegates of the N.O.C.s and I.F.s on the I.O.C. The most comprehensive endeavour, proposed by I.O.C. member Andrianov of the U.S.S.R. in 1959-1960,<sup>10</sup> consisted of admitting all the presidents of N.O.C.s and I.F.s as I.O.C. members. Incumbent members would continue at their posts until retirement and would not then be replaced. At the time the revision was suggested, the I.O.C. consisted of 64 members. These, plus approximately 115 N.O.C. presidents and 25 I.F. presidents, would increase I.O.C. membership to over 200. The modern trend toward a proliferation of self-governing nations and the inclusion of new sports would, doubtless, have balanced the reductions caused by the retirements. The Russian proposal, recognizing this problem of numbers, continued on to reconstruct the hierarchy of the I.O.C. by an abundance of committees to enable this large group to function. The submission was soundly defeated (35 to 7) by the I.O.C. at Athens in 1961.<sup>11</sup>

There can be no question that the "delegate" method of establishing I.O.C. membership would reduce both the autonomy and the independence of the body. The N.O.C.'s representatives would be pressing for decisions favourable to their countries and the I.F. presidents would be considering every motion relative to its effect on their sport. The I.O.C. would become the United Nations of sport--highly democratic but largely impotent.

There are some stated restrictions to I.O.C. membership. First, the new recruit must make a declaration on his debut to the General Assembly of the I.O.C.:



*Recognizing the responsibilities that go with the great honour of serving as (one of) the representative(s) of the International Olympic Committee in my country, (name of his country), I bind myself to promote the Olympic Movement to the best of my ability and to guard and preserve its fundamental principles as conceived by the Baron Pierre de Coubertin, keeping myself as a member free from all political, sectarian or commercial influence.*<sup>12</sup>

Second, since 1966, a retirement age of 72 years has been introduced for all members commencing tenure during that year or later. Prior to 1966, membership was a lifelong privilege. This restriction was not imposed until after many years of discussion, both on the concept itself and on the age to be selected.

Third, a member may be asked to resign or be struck from the membership roll if he fails to support the work of the I.O.C. or to attend meetings for two years; if his nationality or country of residence changes; if he has failed to pay his subscription for more than one year; or if "by reason of circumstances that may arise, [he] is not in a position properly to carry out his duties as a member."<sup>13</sup> Considering that over 300 men have held seats on the I.O.C., the incidence of expulsion of a member has been rare, a situation which likely results from a combination of the prestige of the group and their indulgence for each other's external commitments.

Finally, every member must pay a yearly fee. The amount of this fee has varied over the years, generally showing a tendency toward increasing in size. Changes in money equivalents cause difficulties in precise evaluation, but the assessment seems to have been placed as low as \$25 and as high as \$100.

In spite of eighty years of denunciation, scathing criticism,



and calls for reform both from without and within the I.O.C., the body remains as it began--self-perpetuating, autonomous and, increasingly, a power in world sport.

#### INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE BUREAUCRACY

The business of the I.O.C. is administered by persons elected, appointed, and employed. The elective positions are those of the president, the executive board, and, at times, commission members. Presidential or executive board appointments also fill some of the seats on commissions. The employed positions are those involving the daily operations of the I.O.C. from its offices in Lausanne, Switzerland.

#### International Olympic Committee Presidency

Possibly the most powerful position in the world of amateur sport is that of president of the I.O.C. Since 1894, only six men have been elected to the office: Demetrius Vikelas, 1894-1896; Baron Pierre de Coubertin, 1896-1925; Count Henri de Baillet-Latour, 1925-1942; J. Sigfrid Edström, 1946-1952; Avery Brundage, 1952-1972; and Lord Killanin, 1972 to the present. Vikelas, the first president, assumed the position from the inception of the I.O.C. until the 1896 Games at Athens, primarily as a result of a decision on the part of the committee that the presidency should be held by a resident of the country which was to host the next celebration of the Games. The arrangement was that Coubertin would then occupy the chair from 1896 until the Games of Paris in 1900, when Sloane of the U.S.A. would probably fall heir to





the role, as everyone took for granted that Coubertin's hope for an American Games in 1904 would be fulfilled. However, one report observed that Sloane declined to take the gavel "as he declared that the I.O.C. should continue to be presided over by its founder to avoid endangering the work so far undertaken."<sup>14</sup>

Coubertin remained as president until 1925. He had intended to resign ten years earlier but the advent of World War I caused him to fear for the existence of the Olympic Games and he carried on to superintend the re-establishment of the Games after the war.

On the retirement of Coubertin, a Belgian, Count Henri de Baillet-Latour was elected to the presidency and he held the position until he died in 1942. The I.O.C. was inactive during World War II and, consequently, no successor was immediately named. Vice-President J. Sigfrid Edström, a citizen of Sweden, which was a neutral country in World War II, watched over the offices with the assistance of [Mme.] L. Zanchi, the Swiss secretary. At the first post-war meeting in 1946, Edström was confirmed as president. When he resigned in 1952, Avery Brundage of the U.S.A. stepped into the presidential role which he held firmly until 1972. His resignation resulted in the election of Lord Killanin of Ireland as the sixth president.

The length of time a man may hold the presidency has varied during the life-span of the I.O.C. Vikelas, of course, accepted only for the two-year term. Coubertin's and Baillet-Latour's extended tenures were possible because the established terms of office were ten and eight years, respectively, and successive re-elections were permitted. At the time of Edström's election the period of presidential



tenancy was still eight years, but he resigned after six years. In 1960 the re-elective term was reduced to four years with successive periods allowed. There was some confusion in 1964 when it was discovered that the French and English versions of the rules differed, the French seemingly not authorizing sequential terms. Although Rule 50 stated that the French interpretation of rules took precedence, many members were sure that this restriction on continuous terms of office had not been intended. The Executive Board was requested to straighten out the muddle and successive re-elections of the president have been permitted ever since.<sup>15</sup>

The role of president of a volunteer organization of such magnitude as the I.O.C. is often an expensive and time-consuming avocation. Coubertin spent his life and his fortune in promoting pedagogical sport and building the Olympic edifice. In 1952, retiring President Edström commented that his experience demonstrated that the president should have time and wealth at his disposal.<sup>16</sup> Claims have been made that Brundage personally spent as much as \$50,000 a year on his "hobby."<sup>17</sup> Brundage also travelled extensively, making speeches and attending meetings of sport groups connected with the I.O.C. As is so often the case, when an organization finds a person willing to commit himself to such a gargantuan task, the other members are satisfied to let him do the job. This usually entails relinquishing power to the individual who undertakes the heavy work. The I.O.C. has been no exception, even though the statutes allow only emergency unilateral action to the president, as set out in Rule 16:

The President may take action or make a decision where



circumstances do not permit it to be taken by the International Olympic Committee or its Executive Board. Such action or decision is subject to ratification by the I.O.C. at its next meeting.<sup>18</sup>

The ratification statement has empowered the General Assembly to call the president to account for his actions and to criticize his policies even if his decision cannot be reversed.

The true power of the presidency has developed through the incumbent's extensive knowledge of all problems and incidents. The average member has given a limited amount of time to the I.O.C. and is, therefore, not always adequately informed. The inner circle composed of the president and the Executive Board have faced all difficulties long before most members hear about them. The extensive involvement of the president with all commissions, his access to reports, and his opportunity to use the secretariat staff, puts him in a position to see all facets of problems. The result, of course, is that his opinions are highly esteemed and his advice seldom refused. Here is where the power of the presidency is evidenced within the I.O.C.

None of the gentlemen who has held the president's gavel has been reticent or retiring. Their backgrounds have contributed to strong personalities and what, uncharitably, might be called "superiority complexes." Coubertin and Baillet-Latour were members of the nobility with extensive educations and contacts with influential people. Both Edström and Brundage were highly successful businessmen familiar with decision-making processes and with guiding other men. One of the most potent functions of the I.O.C. presidency is to represent that body to the world. Presidential speeches, press releases, and media conferences place the man before the eyes and ears of the sporting world.



His statements on behalf of the I.O.C. make him the focus of all accolades or censures. The strength of I.O.C. presidents in these situations has contributed to the aura of dictatorship which has appeared to surround them. They have never backed down when challenged, and they have so obviously held the courage of their convictions that I.O.C. members, themselves, have become followers.

These abilities to lead and indoctrinate the I.O.C. members are the heart of the power of the presidential position. What the world may think matters little--the world does not vote at I.O.C. General Assemblies.

#### International Olympic Committee Executive Board

Assisting the president in all I.O.C. tasks is the Executive Board. This board did not evolve until 1921 because Coubertin did not seem disposed to share the guidance of the embryonic I.O.C. When he assumed the presidency in 1896, he did not relinquish the secretary-generalship. He performed both jobs for many years in spite of the fact that as early as 1908 the rules allowed the president to "ask two of his colleagues to assume the functions of secretary and treasurer."<sup>19</sup> Mayer related the inauguration of the Executive Committee:

Coubertin, leaving for a long trip, wished to confide the destinies of the I.O.C. to a "group of devoted members," as he said. Knowing, also, of his coming resignation (1925) he did not wish to leave the responsibilities of the direction of the Olympic Movement in the hands of a single person. His voyage was an ideal pretext. He could, thus, during the four years that he had chosen to remain as president orient this Committee in the path and the line of conduct that he was planning.<sup>20</sup>

On October 1, 1921, the first Executive Committee, as it was then called, was named as proposed by Coubertin himself. The I.O.C.





accepted Baron Codefroy de Blonay (Switzerland) as president of the Executive Committee and the other members were Jiri Guth-Jarkovsky (Bohemia), Count Henri de Baillet-Latour (Belgium), J. Sigfrid Edström (Sweden), and the Marquis de Polignac (France).<sup>21</sup> It should be noted that two future presidents of the I.O.C. were original members of the Executive Committee and that Edström had only been admitted to I.O.C. membership the previous year. Tenure on the Executive Committee was for four years and the retiring members were eligible for re-election. The Executive Committee was to elect a vice-president to fill the president's position if or when necessary.<sup>22</sup> The "President" of the Executive Committee referred to above probably became the vice-president mentioned in the 1923 rules, as Blonay was often alluded to as "vice-president" in discussions subsequent to that time. The 1923 publication outlined the responsibilities of the Executive Committee as follows:

8. The Executive Committee can name, in agreement with the president, a chancellor or secretary to assure the operation of services, the editing and circulation of the minutes, etc. The chancellor may attend the meetings.
9. The Executive Committee manages the finances. It has custody of the archives. It initiates measures undertaken to assure the execution of the Regulations and protocol of the Olympic Games. It proposes to the I.O.C. the persons for election as members of the Committee and establishes the agenda for sessions.<sup>23</sup>

Such was the modest beginning for a group which today wields such power. An additional duty was attached to Rule 9 in 1927:

The members of the Executive Committee are empowered to consider non-technical questions of a general nature which shall be submitted to them by the International Federations and to recommend to the International Olympic Committee the decisions to be taken.<sup>24</sup>

The role of the Executive Committee remained fairly static until



1939 at which time the paragraph added to Rule 9 in 1927 was removed and the opportunity for definite meetings with I.F. representatives was established. Actually, some such meetings had already occurred so the I.O.C. was merely structuring the machinery for them at this point.

10. In co-operation with the Executive Committee there is a Council of Delegates of the International Federations whose sports are included in the Olympic Programme. Each International Federation nominates its delegate each year, who, in the event of his being prevented from attending, can nominate a substitute.
11. This Council shall only come together, either as a whole or partially, when the President of the I.O.C. assembles it for the purpose of considering with the Executive Committee certain general questions, which concern those sports, which are included in the Olympic Games and which are governed by an International Federation.<sup>25</sup>

It would appear that the Executive Committee began to play a larger role in the I.O.C. immediately after World War II because the 1949 revision of the rule book devoted four lengthy rules to its selection and duties:

#### The Executive Committee

13. An Executive Committee is elected from among the members of the International Olympic Committee to facilitate the management of the International Olympic Committee's affairs.

The Executive Committee is composed of the President, the Vice-President, and four additional members. The four additional members are elected to hold office for four years and retire in rotation. A retiring member is not eligible for re-election in the year immediately subsequent to his retirement. If a member dies or retires a new member is elected by the International Olympic Committee to take his place at its next meeting, but the new member holds office only for the remainder of the term of the person whose place he takes. A member so elected is, however, eligible for immediate re-election upon retirement.

The Executive Committee may co-opt a member of the International Olympic Committee to fill a casual vacancy in the Executive Committee, but a person so co-opted serves only until the International Olympic Committee elects a new member of the



Executive Committee at its next meeting when the co-opted member is eligible for election.

14. The Executive Committee carries out such duties as are assigned to it by the International Olympic Committee from time to time, and in particular is responsible for the management of the International Olympic Committee's finances and makes an annual report upon them to the Committee. It keeps the Committee's records and sees that the Rules and the Regulations and Protocol of the Olympic Games are duly observed and carried out. It submits to the Committee the names of persons whom it recommends for election to the International Olympic Committee and it draws up the agenda for the Committee's meetings.
15. Either the Executive Committee or the President alone may take action or make a decision where circumstances do not permit such action or decision to be taken by the International Olympic Committee but such action or decision shall be subject to ratification by the International Olympic Committee at its next meeting.
16. The Executive Committee holds conferences with delegates of those International Federations whose sports are included in the Olympic Games or are under consideration for inclusion in the Games for the purpose of considering general questions affecting those sports in relation to the Olympic Games. Each Federation invited to attend such a conference by the Executive Committee is entitled to send two delegates to the conference but no more.

The conferences are convened by the President of the International Olympic Committee who names the date and place of the meetings and settles all matters of procedure at the meetings. The President of the International Olympic Committee takes the Chair at the conference.<sup>26</sup>

From this point on vice-presidents were elected by the General Assembly of the I.O.C., not by the Executive Committee as was the case previously.

Adjustments in 1955 increased to five the number of additional members and similarly increased their tenure to five years. It is probable that this action was taken because of the heavier work load the I.O.C. was now passing on to the Executive Committee and because of a desire to widen the geographical representation on the Executive Committee.



Provision for meetings with N.O.C.s "when the necessity arises"<sup>27</sup> was made in the 1955 rules and the official title of the body became "Executive Board."<sup>28</sup>

A major hierarchical revision occurred in 1956 when a second vice-president was decided upon. One vice-president was now identified as the "senior" vice-president for the purpose of replacing the president if so required. The total size of the Executive Board remained the same by virtue of the fact that the "additional members" reverted to four and the length of their term was reduced to four years.<sup>29</sup> Almost immediately the I.O.C. must have realized that this decision diminished the opportunity for I.O.C. members to serve on the Executive Board and the 1958 rules boosted the "additional members" back up to five, but left their term of office at four years.<sup>30</sup>

In the 1966 rules, a third vice-president was added to the Executive Board and the privilege of immediate re-election was removed for both members and vice-presidents.<sup>31</sup>

Several changes in 1966 and 1967 were made in response to the ever-increasing complexity of the Olympic world. The role of the Executive Board as administrator of Olympic policy was becoming stabilized and more hired assistance was required to keep up with the work load. The responsibility for the business of the I.O.C. was firmly placed with the Executive Board when it was directed to appoint a secretary-general and approve the hiring of secretaries and translators for the headquarters staff.<sup>32</sup> A reflection of the expanding horizons of the Olympic Movement was evident in 1967 by the requirement that at least one of the three vice-presidents must be a resident of





Europe.<sup>33</sup> Apparently, with both ancient and modern Olympic Games having been a "child" of Europe, contemporary European members were concerned that the situation could arise when Europe was not even represented on the Executive Board. It would appear that all the members had a strong sense of history and/or obligation because the motion carried unanimously.<sup>34</sup>

As the Olympic Games and the I.O.C. have grown into a substantial business in latter years, it has been obvious that the duties and responsibilities of the Executive Board have kept pace. By 1970 the majority of the concerns to be submitted to the annual meeting of the I.O.C. had been fully examined in advance by the Executive Board and their recommendations were usually accepted by the I.O.C. members.

Two trends in the development of the Executive Board membership deserve comment. One was the growth in size from six (including Coubertin) in 1921 to nine in 1970, while the I.O.C. membership increased by only about twenty persons in the same time span. The burden of I.O.C. affairs clearly could not be handled by increasing the general membership and the Executive Board was augmented out of proportion to the main body. The second trend was that, whereas the early members were permitted to continue in office as long as the I.O.C. elected them, from 1966 the rules have limited the terms of office to four years except for the I.O.C. president.<sup>35</sup> The proposal for such limitation on the length of Executive Board membership stressed the need for many I.O.C. members to have the experience of serving on the Executive Board "to improve the knowledge and responsibility of an increasing number of members."<sup>36</sup>



### International Olympic Committee Commissions

Although the Executive Board carries the heaviest responsibility for administration of the I.O.C., much of the development of policy recommendations has arisen in the sub-committees, particularly in later years. These groups, often titled commissions, have been of both standing and ad hoc types, with the members appointed by the president or the Executive Board, or elected by the General Assembly. Some commissions exhibited both kinds of membership selection and might, themselves, have co-opted other members. In recent years there has been a strong move toward the inclusion of non-I.O.C. members on commissions. As those gentlemen so chosen have frequently been executives of N.O.C.s and I.F.s, this practice expanded the contacts of the N.O.C.s and I.F.s with the I.O.C.

It is a curious fact that mention of commissions did not appear in the rules until 1971 when the following sentence dictated the election of chairmen of "Committees":

The International Olympic Committee elects for four years from among its members a Treasurer who is also to be the Chairman of the Finance Committee, a Chief of Protocol, the Chairmen of the Standing Committees, Press and Public Relations and Legislation, as well as the Executive Board.<sup>37</sup>

Because of the many commissions, the general sessions have largely been taken up with hearing their reports. The recommendations put forward have usually been referred back to the Executive Board for consideration before again being brought to the floor of the I.O.C. a year later. While obviously this has been necessary, considering the size of the I.O.C., the system undoubtedly contributes to delays in decision-making.



### National Olympic Committees

While the I.O.C.'s prime role is that of setting policy for the Olympic Movement, the N.O.C.s are intended to be the premier diffusers of the Olympic word in individual nations. The relations of the I.O.C. with the countries connected with the Olympic Movement are administratively controlled by the N.O.C. of each nation. Recognition of an N.O.C. by the I.O.C. permits the national body to enter participants in the Olympic Games. This is the only method by which individuals or teams may become Games competitors. Such was not always the situation. At the time of the 1896 Athens Games there were only six N.O.C.s but thirteen countries participated.<sup>38</sup> Initially it was common practice for the N.O.C.s to be temporary groups which gathered together for the single purpose of collecting athletes to send to the Games. Therefore, the first six--France, Greece, Hungary, U.S.A., Australia, and Chile--were mostly temporary units, although the I.O.C. now accepts the years 1894-1896 as the founding dates for the N.O.C.s of these nations.<sup>39</sup>

Ambiguity surrounds the true historical information regarding the requirement that N.O.C.s be created. An examination of the Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission of the Congress of Paris, June, 1894, has led to the conclusion that no proposal was made at that meeting which would make the organization of N.O.C.s mandatory.<sup>40</sup> The statement published in the *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, July, 1894, as Article XI of the Congress of Paris decisions relative to citizenship of athletes, followed faithfully the Olympic Games Commission recommendation:



- XI that no country may be represented in the Games except by its nationals and that, in each country, eliminations must be held before the Games in order to select, for participation, true champions in each type of sport.<sup>41</sup>

This, assuredly, was not a direct instruction to found N.O.C.s. Two years later at the I.O.C. session convened at Athens on April 9, 1896, Gebhart, the member for Germany, proposed the idea of creating strong National Committees.<sup>42</sup> Despite this, the rules of 1908 did not mention such institutions as being required.<sup>43</sup>

The earliest comment on N.O.C.s and their recognition by the I.O.C. arose in the 1920 rules and emphasized the control by I.O.C. members that was expected:

5. National Committees considered as recognized are those which are constituted by the member(s) of the International Committee for the country in question or in agreement with them. The recognition exists as long as the agreement between them. . . .<sup>44</sup>

By this time 26 N.O.C.s already existed.<sup>45</sup>

An alternative source of I.O.C. historical data that has generally been accepted as authentic is Pierre de Coubertin. His report has contradicted the evidence of the Minutes and rules. He discussed the "setting up of the N.O.C.s" in a "circular-letter addressed to the Members of the I.O.C. . . . Lausanne, December 1920," and reproduced in the *Bulletin of the I.O.C.* August, 1953. Coubertin's account observed:

The second issue of the *I.O.C.'s Bulletin* (October, 1894) actually specifies that "every country must appoint a National Committee which shall be assigned the task to assure its country's participation to the Olympic Games every four years till such a time that it will be its turn to organize the Games at home."<sup>46</sup>

He was, indeed, correct that such a dictum was to be found in the October, 1894 bulletin, but it must be remembered that at that time the Bulletin was written personally by Baron de Coubertin. The quotation he





referred to was taken from an article entitled "Chronique," being an attempt to explain the Games planned for Athens, but was in no way an *official* account of I.O.C. business.

The 1922 Minutes of the I.O.C. reported that Coubertin felt the existing statute relating to N.O.C.s should be changed to reflect the situation of the day. The text adopted at that meeting clearly demonstrated that the I.O.C. recognized the increasing importance of the N.S.G.B.s in the mechanics of producing Olympic teams. The translation in the 1927 rules set out Rule 15 as follows:

15. National Committees must be constituted so as to include representatives of the National Governing Bodies as well as the members of the International Olympic Committee to that country.<sup>47</sup>

The major re-writing of the total rules some years later resulted in a considerably more restrictive pronouncement of conditions under which N.O.C.s would be recognized and might well have been motivated by glaring discrepancies from one country to another:

25. A National Olympic Committee recognized as such by the International Olympic Committee must fulfil the following requirements:

it should include within its organization representatives of all National Governing Bodies in that country whose sport is included in the Olympic programme,

it must include among its members the members of the International Olympic Committee of that country,

it must recognize not more than one body or association in its own country as the National Governing Body of a sport which is the Body recognized by the International Federation of that sport,

it shall be the official body for all Olympic matters in its own country.

All arrangements concerning its taking part in the Olympic Games



and all communications on such matters shall be addressed to it. It must be independent and autonomous.<sup>48</sup>

By 1955 the duties and privileges of N.O.C.s had become a weighty passage in the rules. Where the instructions to N.O.C.s had been relatively brief in 1949, the extent of the section in 1955 indicated that the I.O.C. must have been uneasy about the operations of N.O.C.s and felt the necessity to establish a more complete code of behaviour. That this concern was shared by the N.O.C.s became evident in a speech by President Brundage in 1954:

The N.O.C.[s] themselves have shown their extremely eager desire to see these Rules consolidated, in order to give them power to show a resistance to certain commercial and political pressure[s] which are exercised against them.<sup>49</sup>

It is doubtful whether the copious text which resulted from the deliberations of an I.O.C. sub-committee was successful in its intentions but it certainly attempted to cover all contingencies. Instructions<sup>50</sup> to N.O.C.s included the following (see full text in Appendix D):

1. The requirement that the N.O.C. must be recognized by the I.O.C. if nationals of that country are to participate in the Olympic Games.

2. The purpose of N.O.C.s, that is, to protect the Olympic Movement and to promote amateur sport through "encouragement of the physical, moral and cultural education of the youth of the nation, for the development of character, good health and good citizenship."<sup>51</sup>

3. Granting to the N.O.C.s the exclusive use of Olympic insignia and terms and requiring protection for them against exploitation.

4. Responsibility for organizing, transporting, housing, and controlling the national Olympic team.



5. A requirement to enforce all I.O.C. rules.

6. A charge to remain independent, autonomous, and *"entirely removed from political, religious or commercial influence."*<sup>52</sup>

7. An explanation of the types of individuals eligible to be members of an N.O.C. and the specific groups to be represented on an N.O.C.

8. The categories of persons not eligible for membership.

9. The cycle of elections.

10. A prohibition against accepting salaries or fees because of a member's position on an N.O.C.

11. Procedures to follow for an N.O.C. to obtain I.O.C. recognition.

12. A charge to the I.O.C. member in the country to report to the I.O.C. any conflicts in the rules or actions of the N.O.C. with those of the I.O.C.

Although this version of the statutes governing the activities of the N.O.C.s remained basically stable after 1955, still, brief but significant changes and additions were made in the succeeding years. These alterations have probably reflected some of the problems emerging for the N.O.C.s during this period of surging interest in the Olympic Games. Such a supposition was supported by the introduction in 1956 of a paragraph allowing exceptions to the N.O.C. membership prohibitions.

Evidently, the N.O.C.s were not conforming to the ban placed against professional coaches, athletes, and entrepreneurs as N.O.C. members, as the I.O.C. provided a loophole in their membership regulation:

Exceptions may be made in the above categories by the Executive



Board of the International Olympic Committee in special circumstances, on the recommendation of the National Olympic Committee concerned.<sup>53</sup>

It is unquestionably true that the advent of the U.S.S.R. into the Olympic organization in 1952 brought the "cold war" into the Olympic Games. Both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. used the Olympic competitions as stages on which to expose the superiority of their political ideologies as expressed by athletic prowess. Smaller countries, both well established and emerging, began to see the Olympic Games as opportunities to enhance their national prestige both at home and abroad. More and more often, athletes were considered as potential symbols of national characteristics, and winners, therefore, were exceptionally valuable property. Whether or not the I.O.C. really recognized the futility of combatting these trends, the adjustments to the rules made subsequent to 1955 attest to continuing efforts to reduce such misuse of the Olympic Games.

In 1956 and 1958 several significant changes were made relating to two perpetual problems of the I.O.C.--political contamination and commercialism. The I.O.C.'s desire for complete independence could not be realized if their national agents were susceptible to influence. The nationalistic and materialistic persuasions prevalent in the 1950's surely touched the distant N.O.C.s, even if the I.O.C. was able to remain untainted. The I.O.C.'s reaction was to stress the edict bidding the N.O.C.s to be "completely independent and autonomous and entirely removed from political, religious or commercial influence,"<sup>54</sup> by shifting it to become a separate clause (Rule 25) and placing it in boldface type. An unusual action in 1958 reinforced the gravity of the point at





issue. The following directives were inserted, the first in Rule 24 and the second in Rule 25:

[Rule 24] National Olympic Committees must not associate themselves with matters of a political or commercial nature.

. . . . .  
[Rule 25] National Olympic Committees that do not conform to the Rules and Regulations of the International Olympic Committee forfeit their recognition and their right to send participants to the Olympic Games.<sup>55</sup>

The duplication of the first sentence with the already existing prohibitions against "influence" certainly suggests a magnification of concern with the independence of N.O.C.s. The worry seems to have been sufficiently insistent to provoke the "forfeiture" warning which now became part of the rules.

More rigorous supervision was made possible in 1958 when N.O.C.s were obliged to submit to the I.O.C. Minutes of their meetings at which "members and officers are elected or changed."<sup>56</sup> Evidently this requirement failed to eliminate some practices that the I.O.C. must have felt were being carried out in various N.O.C.s, as an illuminating declaration was introduced into the rules in 1966:

Government representatives are not eligible for election as members of the National Olympic Committee.<sup>57</sup>

That it was this late date before the I.O.C. printed this prohibition suggests the existence of flagrant improprieties that could no longer be ignored.

The extension of I.O.C. control over N.O.C.s became ever more obvious when the I.O.C. ordered that its rules must become part of the constitutions of N.O.C.s to ensure national perpetuation of the Olympic Ideals:



The rules and regulations of the International Olympic Committee shall be incorporated in the rules and regulations of National Olympic Committees and shall be enforced by them in their respective countries or areas.<sup>58</sup>

The procedure for recognition of an N.O.C. by the I.O.C. involves several steps but is relatively straightforward. The N.O.C. concerned sends a request for acceptance to the I.O.C. along with copies of its rules and regulations. The Executive Board of the I.O.C. studies the constitution and, if all requirements are satisfactory, recommends approval to the I.O.C. General Assembly. In effect, the decision lies with the Executive Board, based on its understanding and interpretation of the material provided to it.

The history of the N.O.C.s has traced a most surprising evolution. As individual bodies, their freedom appears to have become more limited with the passage of time, as the I.O.C. instituted more controls and conditions governing them. In a period when more and greater freedoms were being gained by most groupings in society, the N.O.C.s were being subjected to more limitations. However, in the late 1950's and early 1960's many N.O.C.s became restive under the I.O.C. restraints (in spite of Brundage's belief in 1954 that they wished for stronger rules (see page 112)), and demanded a more significant voice in the Olympic enterprise. Regardless of firm I.O.C. opposition, a General Assembly of N.O.C.s was organized and the first conference was held in the autumn of 1965 at Rome.<sup>59</sup> Each N.O.C. that wished to be involved sent delegates to the sessions where topics of common concern were discussed and the recommendations passed on to the meeting of the Executive Board with the N.O.C.s. Relations between the N.O.C.s and



the I.O.C. appear to have improved as a result of the establishment of the N.O.C. General Assembly and the meetings with the Executive Board.

#### International Federation of Sport

The prime difference between the service given by the N.O.C.s and the I.F.s to the Olympic Movement is in the range of their individual efforts. N.O.C.s deal exclusively with tasks within their country but handle a variety of chores. The I.F.s are concerned only with the specifics of controlling one sport but their territory is world-wide. The rules governing the relationships of the N.O.C.s with the I.O.C. were placed in one section of the I.O.C. rules but no such compact category existed for the I.F.s' obligations. Because the I.F.s have functioned as sport-governing bodies for more events than just the Olympic Games, blanket regulations have been beyond the scope of the I.O.C. who can only prescribe conduct pertaining to the Olympic Games. I.F.s could and do exist even if I.O.C. recognition is refused. However, without that recognition the sport concerned cannot be included in the Olympic Games festivals.

Originally the I.O.C. personally supervised the operation of the sports in the Olympic Games. Although the administrative details of the events were handled by the organizing committee (schedules, officials, and so on), other aspects, such as competitive rules and events within sports, were decided directly by the I.O.C. This I.O.C. involvement was necessary because so few I.F.s existed during the formative years of the Olympic Games. Otto Mayer has claimed that four I.F.s were constituted prior to the first Olympic Games--gymnastics



(1881), rowing (1892), ice hockey (1892), and skating (1892)<sup>60</sup>--but the number of national societies affiliated with each was not given. Of the nine sports presented in the 1896 Games,<sup>61</sup> only gymnastics and rowing had any form of international structure. By the time of the Games of 1912 at Stockholm, ten sports were internationalized.<sup>62</sup> Four of the twelve on the program had no I.F.s.<sup>63</sup> Some degree of specific control of the sports on the Olympic Games program remained with the I.O.C. until the Congress of Lausanne of 1921. This congress, convened by the I.O.C. to establish rules governing several areas of Games procedures, gave the management of all technical operations for the Olympic sports to the I.F.s. This action encouraged the formation of I.F.s in that, if none existed, the I.O.C. and/or the organizing committee decided on the rules to be enforced, the events to be offered, and the selection of the officials. Sometimes an N.S.G.B. was called upon to administer the activity in the Games, much to the displeasure of the N.S.G.B.s of other nations who often used different rules and, therefore, had to train their athletes to perform under strange regulations. The solution was for the national bodies to combine to form an international federation and set rules and patterns for world-wide performance of the sport. Through this type of I.O.C. pressure, the stabilization of sport standards occurred which was a great encouragement to international competition. From an early period in their existence, a union of I.F.s had been discussed in an attempt to obtain more leverage with the I.O.C. The feeling of many that they would be relinquishing much of their sovereignty hindered the composition of such a body. Finally, in April 1967, the initial General Assembly of the I.F.s met at Lausanne.





The only area of overlapping interest of the various I.F.s was the Olympic Games and the other multi-sport "games" they spawned. This interaction of international sport groups has been, therefore, an outgrowth of the Olympic Movement. This was a tremendous advance from 1894 when Coubertin found that one key source of resistance to his Olympic Idea was based on "the lack of ability of one sport to collaborate with another."<sup>64</sup>

The role the I.F.s have played in the Olympic Games has changed little since 1921. The *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.* for January, 1927 printed a speech by Baillet-Latour (president of the I.O.C.) which summarized the rights and duties of I.F.s:

The International Federations, whose technical rules are in force, decide the number of events for each sport after agreement with the Executive Committee of the International Olympic Committee; fix, each in their own sport, the number of entrants for each event, keeping within the limits of the General Rules. They have the control of all sporting equipment and the technical control of the events. They choose the Ground Judges and the Judges of Appeal. They shall deal finally with all complaints.<sup>65</sup>

Baillet-Latour did not mention the role of the I.F.s in determining the qualities of the "amateur" athlete. This has been an issue on which the I.O.C. and I.F.s have a long history of discord. The disagreements have been greater or smaller depending on the sport in question and the "professional" opportunities that existed in each.

The N.S.G.B.s whose representatives compose the I.F.s are also the core of the N.O.C.s, inasmuch as the latter's recognition is based on the N.S.G.B.s having a voting majority on the committee. On the one hand, the N.S.G.B.s are expected to concentrate on promoting their sport and, on the other hand, the support of the Olympic Games must



take precedence of interest. Such differing role expectations at the national levels possibly cause some confusion and dilution of effectiveness.

#### International Olympic Committee Secretariat

The headquarters of the I.O.C. is now located in Lausanne, Switzerland, a neutral country, as befits the non-political position taken by the I.O.C. This location was not established until 1915 when Coubertin felt that the centre of the Olympic Movement would be safer in a country not involved in World War I. Until then the *bureau* appears to have meant Coubertin himself, with some little assistance from certain I.O.C. members. Wherever Coubertin lived, there lived the heart and the work of the Olympic Movement. Although Coubertin did not sell his Paris home until 1922,<sup>66</sup> he had earlier adopted Switzerland as his second country and spent much time there after the beginning of the century. On April 10, 1915, an agreement was signed between Coubertin (for the I.O.C.) and the municipality of Lausanne to place the headquarters in that city.<sup>67</sup>

Not until 1922 was a staff installed at la Campagne Mon Repos in the person of the first chancellor, Fred Auckenthaler. His successor in 1925, A. G. Berdez, had the title of his position changed to secretary. Berdez died during World War II and [Mme.] L. Zanchi of Lausanne, who had overseen the limited office operation during 1939-1945, was officially named secretary in 1946. However, as President Edström decided to re-institute the role of chancellor, Otto Mayer was appointed to the post, which he held until 1964, and L. Zanchi, as secretary, did



not hold the senior position. Mayer's successors, Eric Jonas and W. G. Westerhoff, were not given the chancellor's title, but rather were named secretaries-general. About 1968, when the offices were moved from Mon Repos to Château de Vidy, the senior position in the secretariat was designated as director, and has so remained.<sup>68</sup>

The secretariat carries out all the administrative duties of the Olympic Movement. The staff includes a technical director, a public relations man, translators, writers, librarians, and secretaries. As well as the day-to-day business typical of any organization, the headquarters staff also prepares all the publications of the I.O.C. The most important production is the periodical *Olympic Review*, which is the official organ of the I.O.C. The earliest publication was the *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, printed under Coubertin's direction in July 1894, and evidently ceasing after editions of October 1894 and January 1895. A report in the May-August 1967 *Bulletin of the I.O.C.* stated that the *Revue Olympique*, a quarterly communication begun in 1901, was published and financed by Coubertin and terminated at the commencement of World War I. It was 1925 before a new communication emerged entitled *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.* This publication continued until 1938 at which time Carl Diem of Germany took over the production of an *Olympic Review* which appeared until 1944. The end of World War II saw the *Bulletin* resume publication on a quarterly basis. This was changed in 1967 to a monthly *Newsletter*, supplemented by occasional issues of a *Review of the I.O.C.* The contemporary periodical is entitled simply *Olympic Review*.<sup>69</sup>

The secretariat is also responsible for preparation of materials



for the I.O.C. meetings, which occur annually except in Olympic years when one is held at each Games festival. The official Minutes are processed at Château de Vidy and circulated to the members. Most of the printing is done in both French and English because these are the accepted languages of the I.O.C., with French taking precedence in case of dispute over any interpretations.

#### INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE FINANCES

The method of financing the activities of the I.O.C. has been unique from the day of its founding. The necessity for complete independence has reduced the opportunity for financial assistance from outside groups, although funds have occasionally been accepted as gifts from various N.O.C.s.<sup>70</sup> Until the time of Baron de Coubertin's resignation, most of the costs were borne by him out of his personal coffers. In fact, it is generally accepted that his small fortune was practically exhausted by the time of his death.<sup>71</sup> The nominal annual dues paid by each member were extremely inadequate for supporting such a venture as the I.O.C. Even though the members paid all their own expenses for travelling to and attending I.O.C. meetings, Coubertin's voluminous correspondence and the costs of publishing the *Revue Olympique* were in no way covered by the treasury and required his personal subsidization. His penchant for *fêtes* attendant to all meetings and special occasions was also usually satisfied out of his own pocket. Suggestions by members that the N.O.C.s be requested to pay a regular fee into the exchequer were deftly turned aside by Coubertin<sup>72</sup> who much preferred to have the situation continue as it was, probably because of the freedom





that remained both to the I.O.C. and his very personal administration. Even the budget and treasurers' reports were rudimentary.<sup>73</sup>

The first mention of financial arrangements occurred in the 1949 rules, with an addition to the seven "Fundamental Principles":

8. All profits and funds derived from the holding of the Olympic Games (after payment of all proper expenses in connection with their organization and of any contribution to the funds of the International Olympic Committee) are paid to the National Olympic Committee of the country holding the Games and are necessarily applied for the promotion of the Olympic Movement or the development of amateur sport.<sup>74</sup>

It is odd to see such direction emerging at that time, as the era had ended when any Olympic Games festival could turn a genuine profit. The I.O.C. was obviously hopeful that profits would accrue, however, since in 1966 it changed the beneficiary of any financial gains from the N.O.C. of the country concerned to itself.<sup>75</sup> The second (1949) assertion relative to pecuniary matters appeared in the section of the rules dealing with the statutes of the I.O.C. Rule 22 entitled "Subscriptions and Payments" declared the right of the I.O.C. to set the annual subscription rate of the members, and also announced:

22. The International Olympic Committee requires the Committee entrusted with the organization of the Olympic Games as well as the Winter Games to pay to the International Olympic Committee such sums as may be agreed upon as a contribution towards the expenses of the administration of the International Olympic Committee and the development of the Olympic Movement.<sup>76</sup>

This payment had actually been required for some time previous to this pronouncement in the rules. As early as 1929, the Minutes of the I.O.C. referred to such a bond being requested of the Los Angeles Organizing Committee.<sup>77</sup> This income plus the members' fees were the only dependable financial resources of the I.O.C.



The technological world of the mid-twentieth century contributed its talents to solving the fiscal problems of the I.O.C. by developing television and satellite communications. The first statement about television rights being sold was voiced in the 1958 rules and directed that the I.O.C. must approve the sales agreement and would establish the distribution of the proceeds.<sup>78</sup> This decree stands unchanged today.

By 1962, much more rigid commands were drawn up, including limits as to the amount of time that could be given to Olympic Games coverage on any television or movie program per day. As these regulations differed only to a small degree to 1970, they are fascinating to read:

Newsreel showing, whether cinema or television, shall be limited to regularly scheduled shows, where news is the essence of the program, either of networks or individual stations. No individual program may use more than 3 minutes of Olympic footage a day. No network, television station or cinema may use more than three sections of three minutes of Olympic footage in all news programs combined within twenty-four hours, and there shall be at least four hours between each showing. In no case can these newsreel films be used for the compilation of any kind of special Olympic program.<sup>79</sup>

With personal attendance at the Olympic Games being the prerogative of the few, it is difficult to comprehend the reason for such stringent prohibitions.

The division of television proceeds was a thorny problem for the I.O.C. For the first time the I.O.C. had an abundance of resources to utilize. Discussions as to who should receive the monies from the sale of television rights occurred over several years without a definite report being included in the Minutes of I.O.C. sessions. Some



arrangements were certainly arrived at for the Rome Games in 1960 and the Tokyo Games in 1964. The extent of recorded information is represented by Minutes of the 1961 session of the I.O.C. where a confusing statement suggested that the I.O.C. received \$65,000 from the Tokyo Organizing Committee, this being 50 per cent of the I.O.C.'s share of the television revenues. Half of the sum was to be shared among the I.F.s under I.O.C. instructions for its division.<sup>80</sup> More detailed plans were given in the Minutes of the 1966 meeting, when the Executive Board proposed the following division of television receipts:

. . . the first million dollars go entirely to the I.O.C. who would divide it between the International Federations and the National Olympic Committees, on the basis of 1/3 to each, the I.O.C. reserving for itself the final third. The second million would be divided as follows: 1/3 to the Organizing Committee and 2/3 to the I.O.C. who would distribute 2/9 to the I.F.s, 2/9 to the N.O.C.s and 2/9 to the I.O.C. Starting from the third million, 2/3 would go to the Organizing Committee and 1/3 to the I.O.C. to be redistributed as indicated in the preceding paragraph.

In regard to the Winter Games, the progression would be the same starting from the sum of \$200,000.<sup>81</sup>

Vice-President Exeter added a comment to the effect that only I.F.s who designated the Olympic Games as their world championships could share in the proceeds. Later in the session the distribution scheme was accepted, evidently including Vice-President Exeter's rider. The precise wording of the motion was not included in the Minutes, nor was the vote distribution.

This division of television proceeds was to come into effect for the 1972 Olympic Games.<sup>82</sup> The following year at the 1967 session in Tehran, the Marquess of Exeter explained a plan for distributing the television sales money that the I.O.C. would receive from the Mexico



and Grenoble Organizing Committees for the 1968 Games. A total of \$165,450 was to be apportioned among 22 I.F.s with the larger federations obtaining the greatest amounts. The division was based on the gate income each sport had drawn, averaged over the last three Olympic Games. Although the I.F.s of athletics, swimming, football, and equestrian sport had by far the largest percentages, they had "voluntarily given away a big part of their share to assist the smaller Federations."<sup>83</sup> There appeared to be no subsequent discussion on the distribution of television profits. It must be assumed that the "Exeter" plan was applied as outlined.

The transformation of the financial status of the I.O.C. since 1960 is typical of the changes which have occurred in all aspects of the Olympic Games. More commercialism, more political intervention, and less idealism were hallmarks of the period, and seemed to have accompanied the appearance of profit potential. The Olympic Games have become "big business."





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 7

<sup>1</sup>Much of the factual data and some of the textual discussions on the "Structure and Function of the I.O.C." have appeared or are about to appear in publications. See Jean M. Leiper, "International Olympic Association [Committee, sic]," *Journal of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 22(4) (March-April, 1976), 12; see also Jean M. Leiper, "The Structure and Function of the International Olympic Committee" [tentative title], *The Olympic Games*, ed. Peter Graham (Cornwall, N.Y.: Leisure Press, in press, 1976).

<sup>2</sup>*The Hymnary of the United Church of Canada* (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1930), p. 259.

<sup>3</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Rules and Regulations*, (Lausanne: The Committee, 1966), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 1908, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 19.

<sup>7</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 53.

<sup>8</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Aix-en-Provence: Paul Nobaud, 1931), p. 21.

<sup>9</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, cited in Bacon Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896, John Apostol Lucas (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 110.

<sup>10</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Munich, 1959" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1959), p. 20; see also I.O.C., "Minutes . . . San Francisco, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 70 (May, 1960), 51.

<sup>11</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1961," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 76.

<sup>12</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 63.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 1971, p. 14.



<sup>14</sup>Monique Berlioux, "The Organization and Direction of the Olympic Movement," *The International Olympic Academy: Ninth Session, Aug-Sept, 1969, Olympia Greece* (Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1969), p. 121.

<sup>15</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Innsbruck, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 88 (May, 1964), 68; see also I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tokyo, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 89 (February, 1965), 72.

<sup>16</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Helsinki, 1952," p. 4.

<sup>17</sup>William O. Johnson, *All that Glitters is not Gold* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1972), p. 77.

<sup>18</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 16.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 1908, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup>Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 320.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>22</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 4.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

<sup>24</sup>I.O.C., "An Introduction" [to the *Official Rules and Regulations*] as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 3 (January, 1947), 17.

<sup>25</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, pp. 48-49.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, 1949, pp. 8-9.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, 1955, p. 10.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 1956, p. 12.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, 1958, p. 12.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, 1966, pp. 14, 15.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, 1967, p. 14.

<sup>34</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 84.



<sup>35</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1966, pp. 14, 15.

<sup>36</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tokyo, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 89 (February, 1965), 77, App. 3.

<sup>37</sup>I.O.C. . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 15.

In 1974 a new issue of the Rules and Regulations completely eliminated reference to commissions except to reiterate that "The President and Vice-Presidents are *ex officio* members of all sub-committees and commissions," (p. 7). The official *Olympic Directory* of 1973 (pp. 17-20) listed the following groups: Finance Commission, Information and Culture Commission, Rules Editing Commission, Commission for the International Olympic Academy, Emblems Commission, Medical Commission, Tripartite Commission for the Olympic Congress, Joint Commission for the Olympic Programme, Commission for Olympic Solidarity, Commission for the "Administration of an Olympic Games," Awards Commission, and Commission of Enquiry for Rhodesia. The distinction between standing and temporary commissions was not identified, but it seems reasonable that the "Commission of Enquiry for Rhodesia" and the "Tripartite Commission for the Olympic Congress" are examples of groups named to deal with short-term problems.

<sup>38</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: The Committee, 1972), pp. 25, 36.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 25-28.

<sup>40</sup>Olympic Games Commission, "Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission [Congress of Paris], June 19, 21, 1894" (Lausanne: The I.O.C., 1894), pp. 1-26.

<sup>41</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>42</sup>Mayer, pp. 43-44.

<sup>43</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1908.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 1920, p. 9.

<sup>45</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, pp. 25-28.

<sup>46</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, "Circular Letter addressed to the Members of the I.O.C., Lausanne, December, 1920," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 41 (August, 1953), 21.

<sup>47</sup>I.O.C., "National Committees" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 17.



<sup>48</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, pp. 11-12.

<sup>49</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1954," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 46 (July, 1954), 52.

<sup>50</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1955, pp. 11-13.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 1956, p. 17.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 1958, pp. 16, 18.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 1960, p. 19.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Madrid, 1965," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 92 (November, 1965), 74.

<sup>60</sup>Mayer, p. 120. [Discrepancies exist between lists published by the I.O.C. and by Otto Mayer. As some other errors have been discovered in the booklet *Olympism*, produced by the I.O.C., Mayer's information has been accepted as most accurate in this case.]

<sup>61</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, p. 41.

<sup>62</sup>Mayer, p. 120.

<sup>63</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, p. 41.

<sup>64</sup>Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*, p. 10.

<sup>65</sup>Henri de Baillet-Latour, "The rights and duties of the International Olympic Committee, the National Olympic Committees and the International Federations," *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 15.

<sup>66</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 90.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>68</sup>Monique Berlioux, *The International Olympic Academy . . .*, pp. 127-128. [Mme. Berlioux is director of I.O.C. headquarters at this writing.]





<sup>69</sup>[I.O.C.] Editorial, "To the subscribers and readers of the 'Bulletin,'" *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 98-99 (May-August, 1967), 57.  
[This article is the source for all the material on the I.O.C. journal.]

<sup>70</sup>Mayer, p. 86.

<sup>71</sup>Marie-Thérèse Eyquem, *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), p. 282.

<sup>72</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Stockholm, 1912," p. 48.

<sup>73</sup>Mayer, p. 64.

<sup>74</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, p. 6.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, 1966, p. 12.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*, 1949, p. 11.

<sup>77</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1929," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 13 (July, 1929), 6.

<sup>78</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 30.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.*, 1962, pp. 26-27.

<sup>80</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1961, as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 74.

<sup>81</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966, as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 79-80.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>83</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tehran, 1967," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 98-99 (May-August, 1967), 93.



## CHAPTER 8

### IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

#### Introduction

The presidency of an organization of such importance as the I.O.C. carries potential for influence that is difficult to over-estimate. In the case of the I.O.C., its presidents have all been devoted to the cause and eminently capable of handling the challenge they faced.

Throughout its history, the I.O.C. has elected only six presidents to direct its affairs. With the exception of the original president whose tenure was very brief, each has left his mark on the development of the I.O.C. Every president had issues to deal with that were unique to his era while simultaneously attempting to find solutions for the continuing problems hampering the achievement of Olympism. Even though the means and opportunity were available for the members of the I.O.C. to elect a new leader, every president was retained in office until his death or voluntary resignation. The members must have decided that the man at the helm was performing well in guiding the I.O.C. through its perpetually troubled waters. The personalities and abilities of each president, therefore, must have had an impact on the members and on the decisions they made.

#### Demetrius Vikelas

For the most part, Demetrius Vikelas, the first president (from 1894 to 1896), was a figurehead, as Coubertin was the true guiding spirit



from his position as secretary-general. Vikelas's enthusiasm for the Olympic Idea made him an excellent choice for membership on the first I.O.C., but he was not involved in sports. He was asked by the Greek Gymnastic Association to represent it at the Congress of Paris because he lived in Paris part of each year. He was a well-known man of letters in Greece, but until this time had little connection with the sporting world.

The contributions Vikelas made to the Olympic Games were mostly behind-the-scenes actions except for his chairmanship of the Olympic Games Commission of the Congress of Paris, and even then he operated in Coubertin's shadow.<sup>1</sup> His collaboration with Coubertin on the suggestion that Athens host the first Games was not evident as it was Coubertin who put the idea forward to the commission.<sup>2</sup> When this inspiration was successful, it was logical that Vikelas should be on Coubertin's list for the original committee to insure that a Greek could be the president during the preparations for the 1896 Games. As soon as the Paris meetings were concluded, Vikelas returned to Greece to undertake his first task--that of convincing the Greek government to give financial support to the Games. In spite of all his good efforts he was not successful, largely due to political wrangling then occurring in Greek government circles. His most noteworthy act seemed to be his warning to Coubertin of the trouble that was brewing, thus allowing Coubertin ample time to travel to Greece and tackle the difficulties personally.<sup>3</sup> Little more was heard about Vikelas until the I.O.C. meetings in April, 1896. He chaired these meetings and then turned the presidency over to Coubertin for the period until the Paris Games in 1900.<sup>4</sup>



Baron Pierre de Coubertin

In contrast to Vikolas, Pierre de Coubertin (president from 1896 to 1925) was the heart and soul of the Olympic Movement for as long as he lived. His dedication was complete and his family and fortune suffered as a consequence of his devotion to an ideal. Present members of the I.O.C. are as likely as were his confrères to quote Coubertin's attitudes on any Olympic problem. His writings and speeches have frequently been cited in support of I.O.C. points of view and actions. His theories were as widely known to sportsmen of the early twentieth century as were those of President Brundage to contemporary sportsmen. Indeed, few of Brundage's pronouncements have not hearkened back to Coubertin's sentiments in order to explain modern Olympism to his sceptical listeners.

As grandiloquent on paper as in speech, Coubertin welcomed every opportunity to verbalize his Olympian concepts. His talent with words was worthy of the greatest essayists and orators, and this gift may well have been the salvation of the first Olympic Games in Athens. Greek officialdom was split into two camps over the desirability of Athens hosting the 1896 Games. The difficulty of financing the venture was the prime cause of dissension, but other issues might well have influenced the situation. Some Greeks were resentful of the Frenchman who had created the project to restore to Athens some of her former glory. By October, 1894, Coubertin was in Athens to tackle the opposition personally, and the enthusiasm of the Greek people for the Games encouraged him to accept the challenge of convincing powerful Greek citizens to take over the Games organization and see the task to fruition. Coubertin





seized the occasion of a gathering of the Parnassus Literary Society to make a speech extolling the virtues of modern athleticism based on the ancient Greek ideal of the harmony of man. This speech has been described as "brilliant."<sup>5</sup> He followed this performance with an article in the Athens journal *Asty*, which concluded with the observation: "We French have a proverb that says the word 'impossible' is not in the French language. I have been told the word is Greek. I do not believe it."<sup>6</sup> Coubertin's personal intervention unquestionably had an effect. The Crown Prince of Greece took control of the planning, George Averoff supplied much of the money, and, despite continuing resistance from government circles, the Olympic Games became a reality.<sup>7</sup>

From that juncture onward, Coubertin's single-handed supervision of the Olympic Movement set his seal on the enterprise for future decades. His dedicated leadership inspired others with faith and confidence in the power of great ideals to be diffused throughout the world through the medium of the Olympic Games. Nevertheless, Coubertin was not satisfied to rest the case on lofty ideals and a well-turned phrase. He fully recognized the need for traditions and symbols to exemplify the Olympic Games to the people of the world. Many of the present emblems and ceremonies of the Olympic Games were his inspirations. (For further discussions, see Chapter 5.) Lekarska appreciated both Coubertin's sensitivity and talent when she wrote:

Pierre de Coubertin was a master in combining vision and purpose. If the Olympic Games were to become a success they had to be made attractive to the eye, appealing to emotion, great in simplicity and discreet in glamour. His fertile imagination was regulated by a fine sense of proportion. Attractiveness to the eye was not to degenerate into showiness; appeal to emotion into drama, simplicity into staleness and glamour into a blaze.



. . . He needed symbols to give a concise expression to his ideas, a ceremony suited to their loftiness and words that would strike the imagination.<sup>8</sup>

The earliest device of the Olympic Games, the slogan "*Citius, Altius, Fortius*" (Faster, Higher, Stronger), was borrowed by Coubertin, not invented by him. It was first used at the Congress of Paris in 1894<sup>9</sup> and ever since then has been prominently placed on all I.O.C. publications and in stadiums hosting the Games. The unique flag with the five Olympic rings was designed by the Baron in 1914 but was not flown at an Olympics Games until 1920 at Antwerp. Also at Antwerp, another of Coubertin's creations had its initiation. This was the oath of the athletes which was pronounced by a Belgian athlete in the name of all the competitors in the Games. Furthermore, Coubertin had an influential hand in the formulation of the major ceremonies of the Games.

From Baron de Coubertin's extensive writings and speeches have come a legacy of *bon mots*, usually phrases which explained his idealistic approach to sports and the Olympic Games. Coubertin's most famous saying falls into this category, and was quoted on the frontispiece of the 1967 issue of the *Olympic Rules and Regulations*:

The most important thing in the Olympic Games is not to win but to take part, just as the most important thing in life is not the triumph but the struggle. The essential thing is not to have conquered but to have fought well.<sup>10</sup>

This quotation--considered to be the most characteristic of the Olympic Movement and of Coubertin's beliefs, and which appears on the scoreboard at each Games festival--was not entirely of his own devising. It was included in a speech Coubertin gave at a British government dinner in London at the time of the 1908 Olympic Games. Near the end of his



discourse, when he spoke of the increasing threats to "fair play" and the Olympic Idea, he declared he was sure "opinion would support us" in a crusade against such denigration. He continued:

Last Sunday, in the course of the ceremony organized at St. Paul's in honour of the athletes, the Bishop of Pennsylvania recalled this in felicitous words: "the important thing in these Olympiads is less to win than to take part in them." Gentlemen, let us bear this potent word in mind. It extends across every domain to form the basis of a serene and healthy philosophy. The important thing in life is not victory, but struggle; the essential is not to have won but to have fought well. To spread these precepts is to prepare the way for a human race which will be at once braver and stronger, and more scrupulous and generous. These are the ideas which dominate our group [I.O.C.].<sup>11</sup>

Since then, the words of the bishop have been connected with Coubertin's interpretation to become the watchword of the Olympic Movement.

Another favourite quotation refers to Coubertin's law of "diminishing returns." As a direct quote it would appear that he reversed the emphasis:

For 100 to go in for physical training, 50 must go in for sport. For 50 to go in for sport, 20 must specialize. For 20 to specialize, 5 must prove capable of outstanding feats.<sup>12</sup>

The similar sporting "pyramid" usually envisaged by physical educators and recreationists would read:

For 5 to prove capable of outstanding feats, 20 must specialize;  
for 20 to specialize, 50 must go in for sport; for 50 to go in  
for sport, 100 must "participate."

However, Coubertin meant that the outstanding five will motivate the one hundred, thereby justifying the elitism of the Olympic Games as an extension of his theories of sport being an integral part of education.

A statement by Coubertin (quoted previously on page 70) predicted the world of international sport as it is known in this day of



extensive international trade, and is unmistakably a Coubertinism:

"Let us export rowers, runners and fencers; there is the free trade of the future . . . ." <sup>13</sup> Whether it is as much evidence of free trade as it is of diplomatic one-upmanship is debatable, with the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. competing to see who can gain the most influence in the Third World through the loan of sport coaches.

Despite Coubertin's uncontested position as founder of the Olympic Movement and the esteem in which he was held by I.O.C. members, not all of his opinions were accepted. The generation of ever-increasingly explicit and all-encompassing rules seems to be a case in point. Although he recognized the need for stated principles, Coubertin appeared disinclined to shape these into the form of rules. Until late in his tenure as president, the Olympic regulations were brief and rather indefinite. He believed that whatever rules were established should be the result of consultations between the various groups involved in promoting Olympic sport. The result of this attitude was the sequence of eight Olympic Congresses held from 1897 to 1930. <sup>14</sup> Certainly the complex and definitive rules which now exist were composed by the I.O.C. after Coubertin resigned. He was particularly doubtful about the wisdom or value of setting rigid amateur rules, feeling they might legislate against the lower socio-economic classes. <sup>15</sup>

Coubertin's guiding thoughts were also ignored on the topics of the participation of women in the Olympic Games and the inclusion of team sports in the program. On these two points he remained adamant all his life that they should not be part of the core program of Olympic events. <sup>16</sup> Particularly in reference to women's competition was





Coubertin unyielding. He did allow that team sports and feminine contests might be acceptable as auxiliary encounters away from the locations of Olympic focus.<sup>17</sup> For Coubertin, the Olympic Games were intended to honour the young male, adult, individual. Nevertheless, organizing committees and the I.O.C. membership held different views, and team sports and women took part in the Olympic Games from 1900 onwards.<sup>18</sup>

At the I.O.C. meeting in Prague in 1925, after the election of Baillet-Latour, Coubertin was acclaimed "Honourary President of the Olympic Games" for life and the distinction was never to be accorded to any person after him. Actually the exact title was Coubertin's own suggestion. Sherrill (U.S.A.) had proposed that Coubertin be named "Honourary President" (evidently referring to the I.O.C.), but Coubertin declared that as "the International Committee has not had and must not have an Honourary President . . . [he] . . . could accept only the Honourary President of the Games."<sup>19</sup> So be it. It should be noted that on Edström's retirement in 1952, he was given the title of "Honourary President of the I.O.C." in spite of Coubertin's protestations in 1925.<sup>20</sup>

Coubertin received numerous awards from many nations during his lifetime both for his work in educational reform and for his leadership of Olympism and the Olympic Games. Several times his supporters proposed that his name be put forward for the Nobel Peace Prize, and in 1936 he was nominated by the I.O.C. President Baillet-Latour reported to the February, 1936 session at Garmisch-Partenkirchen: "The candidature of Baron de Coubertin has been entered by the due date to the Nobel



Prize Committee in Oslo. The vote occurs next November."<sup>21</sup> In an undated letter (to W. Boin) Coubertin passed along advice from his friends relative to a "campaign" of support. Evidently Boin had written inquiring about the protocol to be followed to strengthen the Baron's candidacy, and Coubertin responded:

It seems it is preferable not to make any "campaign" at the moment. I mean any campaign with a concerted appearance. The candidatures must be put forward before 1 February by "Members of Parliament" (!) This has been done. Since the decision will not be taken until the beginning of the winter it is necessary to wait, my friends say, the celebration of the XIth Olympiad before acting again.<sup>22</sup>

Unfortunately for Coubertin and his advocates, an Argentinian diplomat was the Nobel Peace Laureate for 1936.<sup>23</sup>

Baron de Coubertin resigned from the I.O.C. in 1925 to return to his deep interest in the promotion of educational reforms. For a time he continued as director of the Olympic Museum at Mon Repos in Lausanne, and in 1929 he established an International Bureau de Pédagogie Sportive in that city.<sup>24</sup> By the end of his life, Coubertin's financial resources had been drained by his projects.<sup>25</sup> In 1936, F. Messerli, the official I.O.C. historian, set up a "Pierre de Coubertin Fund" to assist the Baron to continue his work in the educational field. Although 50,000 Swiss francs were received, Coubertin declined to accept the money for his own use. As there was no longer any inheritance for his family, he gave these funds to his wife to administer for his daughter.<sup>26</sup>

Pierre de Coubertin died of a heart attack while walking in a Geneva park on September 2, 1937.<sup>27</sup> His remains were buried in a Lausanne cemetery but, in response to his own desire, his heart was



removed and interred in a white marble stele across the road from the stadium of Ancient Olympia in Greece.<sup>28</sup>

It cannot be denied that as long as the Olympic Games endure some imprint of Coubertin's thought will be preserved. As long as the I.O.C. remains a self-recruiting body, Coubertin's ideals will not be denied. As long as man competes in sport, Coubertin's spirit will live.

#### Count Henri de Baillet-Latour

Count Henri de Baillet-Latour became the third president (from 1925 to 1942) of the I.O.C. when Coubertin resigned in 1925. He had been an I.O.C. member since 1903. The Belgian Olympic Committee was founded by him in 1904, and he was president of the Antwerp Organizing Committee for the 1920 Olympic Games. Mayer indicated that this performance influenced the members when presidential election time came along in 1925.<sup>29</sup> One would have expected Blonay to succeed to the chairmanship, as he had been caretaker president while Coubertin was in the army in World War I, and had been vice-president since the inception of the Executive Board in 1921. However, Baillet-Latour was the strong choice.<sup>30</sup>

Baillet-Latour's ability to present the 1920 Games in war-torn Belgium with only one year's notice suggests a man with determination bordering on stubbornness. Such characteristics were needed by the president when he faced his greatest crisis over the 1936 Olympic Games in Germany. When Hitler came to power the Games had already been allocated to Berlin. It was not long before consternation permeated sports



groups in many countries. There was widespread fear that the Nazi racist policies would be impressed on the Games. The position of Jewish athletes was the major worry among sports groups. It was suspected that German Jewish athletes would not be admitted on the German team and that visiting Jewish competitors would receive severe treatment by the German public. Many people were afraid that by sending teams to the Olympic Games other nations were giving tacit support to Nazism or, at the least, ignoring the deplorable attitudes of the German government. Movements were organized in the U.S.A. and Britain to convince N.O.C.s to refuse to send participants to Nazi Germany. Apprehension was strongly felt within the I.O.C., particularly by Baillet-Latour in his leadership role. In three consecutive years prior to 1936, he caused reassuring statements to be issued, either by the German I.O.C. members or by himself. In 1933, at Vienna, the three German members assured the I.O.C. that the government of Germany had promised to observe all Olympic regulations and that "in principle, German Jews will not be excluded from German teams . . . ." <sup>31</sup> Although this declaration was generally accepted, Baillet-Latour must have remained in some state of trepidation, possibly because of the "in principle" qualification. Again, in 1934, the question of Germany's commitment was raised by British and United States members. Baillet-Latour stated he had "not ceased to be in contact on this subject with his German colleagues . . . [and Ritter von Halt] . . . solemnly declares that the promise made at Vienna [1933] is loyally held." <sup>32</sup> On November 6, 1935, Baillet-Latour, who was in Berlin, declared that:

. . . the conversations I have had with the Chancellor of





Germany, as well as my own inquiry, have convinced me that nothing opposes holding the Games of the XIth Olympiad at Berlin and Garmisch-Partenkirchen. The conditions required by the Olympic Charter have been respected by the Olympic Committee of Germany.<sup>33</sup>

It is difficult to accept the premise that Baillet-Latour honestly felt the Games could be kept separate from politics, but that must have been the case. He felt that, if the Olympic regulations were observed (which they were), then the political milieu which covertly surrounded the Games was no business of the I.O.C. To judge the German political atmosphere would be to open the I.O.C. door to political involvement and that door might really be the lid to Pandora's box. Was Baillet-Latour really convinced when, at the 1936 session in Berlin, he congratulated Lewald, Ritter von Halt, and Mecklenberg for their having "caused the penetration, at all levels of the German population, such enthusiasm and *so perfect an understanding of the Olympic ideal* [italics not in the original]." <sup>34</sup>? If so, as a Belgian in 1939, he must have realized the superficiality of that "understanding."

Baillet-Latour's belief that Berlin had, indeed, presented a non-political Olympic Games must have been the result of his own successful clashes with Hitler. He appears to have won every battle, drawing upon all his personal resources. Descriptions of the Count have used attributes such as: "remarkable courage," "dignified air," "haughty," "lofty superiority," "grand seigneur," and "aristocrat." These qualities were much in demand when he faced up to Hitler as he did on four well-documented occasions. The first incident came about when Karl Ritter von Halt, I.O.C. member to Germany, was named to head the organizing committee for the Olympic Winter Games at Garmisch-Partenkirchen.



Hitler attempted to remove Ritter von Halt from his post along with S. E. Lewald, who was the president of the Berlin Organizing Committee and also an I.O.C. member. The new man was to be Hans von Tschammer und Osten, the "Reichsportführer." Baillet-Latour immediately visited Hitler in Berlin and threatened withdrawal of the Games from both Berlin and Garmisch-Partenkirchen if any substitutions were made in the two positions. Hitler backed down.<sup>35</sup>

The second episode happened in Garmisch-Partenkirchen shortly before the Winter Games were to begin. Baillet-Latour was incensed at the anti-Jewish posters along the roads and tackled Hitler on the subject, claiming that:

. . . he did not consider it proper for Germany, when about to receive athletes of all creeds and nationalities within her borders to offer public insults to certain of them.

As the two men had no common language, the exchange was carried out through Hitler's interpreter, Schmidt. Hitler argued that,

. . . the racial question was a matter of primary importance in Germany and that he could not modify his entire politics for the sake of a question of mere Olympic protocol.<sup>37</sup>

Baillet-Latour was adamant and threatened to forbid the celebration of the Games if the offending signs were not removed. Hitler's excitement rose to the point where Schmidt stopped translating and allowed the "'crisis' to run its course as if he were well used to scenes of this nature."<sup>38</sup> Hitler finally fell silent and then capitulated.

Ritter von Halt related another confrontation between these two men. It occurred on the first day of the 1936 Summer Games when some event winners were brought to Hitler to receive his personal congratulations. Baillet-Latour saw this unscheduled activity and, as the



second day's competitions began, went with Ritter von Halt to Hitler's box to remonstrate this behaviour, as such receptions were contrary to I.O.C. protocol. Again Hitler acquiesced and henceforth only German victors were greeted in his private quarters.<sup>39</sup> This anecdote gives credence to the assertion that Hitler never refused to shake hands with Jesse Owens, as has so often been reported--he was able to avoid any confrontation.

The most fascinating "Hitler versus Baillet-Latour" skirmish was related by Avery Brundage. He contended that prior to the 1936 Games there were suspicions that the Führer would blatantly attempt to take over the Games for Nazi propaganda purposes. Baillet-Latour arrogantly exclaimed to Hitler:

The Olympic Games are not held in Berlin, in Los Angeles or in Amsterdam. When the 5-circled Olympic flag is raised over the Stadium it becomes sacred Olympic territory and theoretically, and for all practical purposes, the Games are held in ancient Olympia. There, I am the master.<sup>40</sup>

As Brundage recorded no response from Hitler, the Führer may well have been rendered temporarily speechless.

Baillet-Latour's determination that the Games would be held in Berlin in spite of German politics reinforced the non-political stance of the I.O.C. No doubt his leadership at that time stiffened the resolution of the I.O.C. members to resist political interference. It is possible that the similar attitude adopted by Brundage at Munich in 1972 was modelled on Baillet-Latour's example. During the time of the 1936 crisis, Brundage was chairman of the United States Olympic Committee and a neophyte member of the I.O.C.

Baillet-Latour was far from being a talented orator in the vein



of his predecessor. In fact, the Count's best-known statement was really borrowed from Coubertin. The assertion "Amateurism is a state of mind, not a law"<sup>41</sup> would seem untimely, at best, as the I.O.C. under Baillet-Latour's guiding hand was putting more law and less spirit into its amateur definition as each Games festival went by.

The actions of Baillet-Latour in respect to the 1936 Games show the great determination he brought to the president's position throughout his tenure. His leadership was stable and persevering during a period of tremendous expansion of interest in the Olympic Games. It was his unhappy lot to see this growth halted when the Games of 1940 were cancelled due to World War II. Baillet-Latour died of a heart attack on January 6, 1942,<sup>42</sup> soon after he was informed of the death of his only son who was training with the Free Belgian Forces in the U.S.A.

#### J. Sigfrid Edström

At the time of Baillet-Latour's death, J. Sigfrid Edström was the vice-president of the I.O.C. and automatically assumed the acting presidency (1942-1946) when the position fell vacant. Edström, of Sweden, was already well known in the sporting world when he stepped into the president's office to finish Baillet-Latour's term. In 1946, at the first I.O.C. General Assembly after the war, he was elected (serving from 1946 to 1952) to the presidency in his own right.

Edström was an excellent athlete. Before the turn of the century, he held the Swedish track record for the 150 metres but there is no evidence of his participation in the Olympic Games. By 1901, he was involved with sports administration in Sweden and was one of the





organizers of the 1912 Olympic Games. He was also the moving spirit behind the founding of the International Amateur Athletic Federation in 1912, at the Stockholm Games and held the office of president from that juncture until 1946. On acceptance into the I.O.C., he was immediately set the task of presiding over the Olympic congresses at Lausanne in 1921 and at Prague in 1925. After only one year as an I.O.C. member, Edström was named to the first Executive Board, became its vice-president in 1931, and remained part of that body until he retired in 1952. His term as president was not long, in that he was 76 years of age at the time of his election.<sup>44</sup> Edström's greatest value to the I.O.C. could have been his first-hand athletic experience, both as a performer and administrator.

Otto Mayer, who was named chancellor of the I.O.C. by Edström in 1946, described him as "rather lively and sometimes stormy."<sup>45</sup> When Coubertin requested Edström to preside over the 1921 Congress of Lausanne, Mayer said he "brought an intelligent ability and authoritarian grasp which became legendary when he became I.O.C. president."<sup>46</sup> Mayer went on to quote A. Massard, I.O.C. member to France, who, in 1947, said Edström had "a hand of iron in a glove of 'Suede.'"<sup>47</sup> The picture drawn was one of a man who knew what was needed and was fully capable of achieving it.

The preceding comment that Edström was "sometimes stormy" was borne out by two incidents which Mayer related pertaining to the affair of the two Chinas. The stories also suggested that Edström was not a man to be easily manipulated. Mayer, as chancellor, attended Edström at private meetings as well as at official ones and so could give some



interesting insights. In 1952, at the Oslo Winter Games, the People's Republic of China requested a meeting with the president to discuss the possibility of recognition by the I.O.C. The suppliant was an attaché of the Chinese embassy at Oslo representing the All-China Athletic Federation. In a meeting with the chancellor and the Chinese diplomat, Edström explained the rules for acceptance of an N.O.C. Mayer reported: "His lack of success and the arrogance of the delegate was such that Edström, in a familiar gesture, hit the table with his cane . . . and left."<sup>48</sup> This was not the only such incident between the Chinese and Edström. Again, Mayer related the story from his personal experience. The People's Republic of China delegate was presenting his case for a second time in Helsinki a few months later:

The I.O.C. had a member in Pekin since 1947. He was part of the old Committee most of which were refugees in Formosa. At Helsinki, Edström asked the Chinese delegate about Mr. Tung-Shou-Yi (that was his name) who they believed dead. The Chinese delegate declared that that was an error because the gentleman was still alive. "Where is he," asked Mr. Edström. "At Pekin," he was answered. Edström retorted "His place is here, have him come." . . . . Three days later Mr. Tung-Shou-Yi presented himself before the Executive Board accompanied by an interpreter from the Chinese embassy at Stockholm. Edström asked the interpreter to leave. He refused on the pretext that Mr. Tung-Shou-Yi spoke only Chinese. The chancellor, who was present, remembered very well having conversed in English with this member at London in 1948. At Helsinki he had received the order to understand only Chinese. Aggravated, the president, striking his cane on the table, expelled them both.<sup>49</sup>

Edström's strong leadership set the tone for the post-war I.O.C., making smooth the transition from inactivity to activity. When he re-convened meetings after the war, the members seemed to pick up and carry on as if there had been no seven-year hiatus: topics presented for discussion in 1946 were similar to those of 1939. However, as the



Olympic Games were gaining a greater world-wide audience, the proliferation of countries and flare-ups of political tension had subsequently brought more intricate questions to the I.O.C. On Edström's resignation in 1952, his legacy to Brundage was little except political problems and racial issues added to the time-resistant puzzle of the amateur code.

### Avery Brundage

When Avery Brundage became president (serving from 1952 to 1972), he inherited not only the left-over problems but also Coubertin's mantle of dedication to Olympism. More than any other of his predecessors, Brundage exhibited a public determination to keep the Olympic Games pure and free from political manipulation and amateur decay. Brundage's rigid attitude may have been shared by the previous presidents, but the advent of world-wide communication and the growth of interest in the Olympic Games in the preceding twenty years caused heightened attention to be paid to this leader.

Although the I.O.C. has always been faced with making decisions with a political cast, in the years of Brundage's leadership such problems became both more numerous and far-reaching. The degree to which Brundage reflected the opinion of the I.O.C. relative to these problems is little known because the actual voting records are rarely published and the president is the only individual entitled to speak publicly for the I.O.C.<sup>50</sup> Actually there were times when the I.O.C. made decisions not precisely as Brundage would have wished, but its position was never so divergent from Brundage's own that he was unable to defend it enthusiastically to the world.<sup>51</sup>



Brundage's fight to retain amateurism as the hallmark of the Olympic Movement has revealed his tenacity at its extreme. It must be admitted, however, that his perseverance was more often evident in ideological pronouncements than in any direct actions to ensure conformity by the athletes. Because of his insistence on amateurism in the face of a materialistic world, the president has been styled by athletes and newsmen as "Slavery Avery" and "Bondage Brundage."<sup>52</sup>

A possible source of Brundage's determined opposition to relaxing the eligibility code of the I.O.C. may be found in his personal athletic history. Although Brundage's family was very poor, he succeeded in putting himself through college while at the same time training in athletics. He participated in the 1912 Olympic Games in the pentathlon placing fifth,<sup>53</sup> and in the decathlon in which he was unplaced. From 1914 to 1918 he completely dominated the competitions for the "American All-Round Championship."<sup>54</sup> During this period his business life was progressing to the point that, in 1915, he established his own construction firm, the Avery Brundage Company. When he retired undefeated from the all-round event in 1918, he became an outstanding handball player and also involved himself in sport administration. His ability to be extremely successful in business while continuing his athletic hobby at a high performance level prompted Brundage's insistence that no athlete requires financial support and that high achievement sport as an avocation is attainable.<sup>55</sup>

Descriptions of Avery Brundage's personality and character have concentrated on his "energy . . . devotion to sport, and rigid code of personal behaviour."<sup>56</sup> Mandell also admitted Brundage's "affability,"





but Shapen commented that he was "too autocratic to be altogether popular."<sup>57</sup> Douglas Roby, I.O.C. member to the U.S.A., had a "profound respect" for Brundage's "managerial abilities."<sup>58</sup> Certainly the I.O.C. developed a much more business-like organization under Brundage's leadership. He re-instituted Coubertin's technique of using presidential circular letters to inform members of potential problems and of his attitudes to these. His autocratic mien was emphasized by Roby's evaluation of I.O.C. decisions. Roby claimed that, at meetings, several views would be aired, "but the result always seems to come out Brundage."<sup>59</sup>

Canada ran afoul of this predilection of the I.O.C. to conform to Brundage's opinions when Banff, Alberta, was bidding for the right to host the 1972 Winter Games. The vote took place at the 1966 meeting in Rome. After the Banff presentation, Brundage spoke of

. . . the very large number of protests he had received . . . [from people] interested in the protection of Nature who have expressed their hope of not seeing Canada give the example of profaning natural resources of the country.<sup>60</sup>

Notwithstanding submissions describing the vast size of Banff National Park and the support of other nations with extensive experience in wildlife conservation, Brundage closed the discussion thus:

. . . we could not set aside all the protests . . . which came from informed circles, universities and clubs. Despite the fact that the Prime Minister supports the candidature of Banff, the I.O.C. should not, in principle, be the cause of a controversy within a country, with its international implications, and risk hostile demonstrations at the time of the Games.<sup>61</sup>

On the first ballot Sapporo, Japan gained 32 of the 61 votes and the right to stage the 1972 Olympic Winter Games.<sup>62</sup> (The number of votes for Banff was not stated.)



As spokesman for the I.O.C. and Olympism, Brundage had more detractors than supporters outside the I.O.C. For the most part he appeared to be impervious to criticism, but one time it became so vitriolic that he sued a French newspaper and the writer of the article for defamation of character and won the suit.<sup>63</sup> Occasionally, the sporting press recognized idealism as Brundage's motivating force, as noted by Arthur Daley's comment that "not even Sir Galahad could have been more selfless or idealistic, although Sir Avery frequently has resembled a different type of knight, Don Quixote."<sup>64</sup>

Brundage's public statements often became the focus of attacks. His tendency to exalt the power and influence of the Olympic Movement frequently led to derisive rebukes. His most famous "pious pronouncement" highlighted the difference between ideological intent and actual practice:

The Olympic Movement today is perhaps the greatest social force in the world. It is a revolt against Twentieth Century materialism---a devotion to the cause and not to the reward. It is a revolt against discrimination, racial, religious or political. It is a glorious living demonstration of that hopefully felicitous maxim coined in Tokyo "The world is one."<sup>65</sup>

Brundage's version of amateurism identified him as a true disciple of Coubertin's religion of sport:

Amateur sport is a delicate and fragile thing. Its values are intangible. They come from the delight of physical expression, the broadened outlook, the deepened experience, and the self-satisfaction and joy of accomplishment to the participant.<sup>66</sup>

Few athletes, sport administrators, or sports reporters have been able to accept such utterances as being realistic views of the contemporary sports world. However, no amount of denunciation swayed Brundage from his convictions or the pursuit of his interpretation of his presidential



tasks.

The fact that the Olympic Games and purposes have altered little since 1952 has been due largely to the inflexible insistence of Brundage that the original aims of Coubertin could yet be attained by faith and dedication. His leadership was of the old-fashioned, evangelical kind, so zealous and steadfast to the purpose that few were capable of opposing him. Brundage was, indeed, an anachronism in today's world.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 8

<sup>1</sup>Olympic Games Commission, "Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission [Congress of Paris], June 19, 21, 1894" (Lausanne: The I.O.C., 1894), pp. 4-26.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>3</sup>Bill Henry, *An Approved History of the Olympic Games* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1948), p. 39.

<sup>4</sup>Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 44.

<sup>5</sup>John Apostol Lucas, "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1886" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962), p. 117.

<sup>6</sup>Henry, pp. 40-41.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-42.

<sup>8</sup>Nadejda Lekarska, *Essays and Studies on Olympic Problems* (Sofia: Medicina i Fizcultura, State Publishing House, 1973), p. 15.

<sup>9</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), pp. 1, Masthead; 3, col. 3.

<sup>10</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1967), Frontispiece.

<sup>11</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon (Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), pp. 19-20.

<sup>12</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: The Committee, 1972), p. 5.

<sup>13</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 1.

<sup>14</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 76.

<sup>15</sup>Marie-Thérèse Eyquem, *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966), p. 273.

<sup>16</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 133.





<sup>17</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 129.

<sup>18</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, pp. 37, 41.

<sup>19</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Prague, 1925" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1925), p. 14.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., Helsinki, 1952, p. 6.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 1936, p. 2.

<sup>22</sup>Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea*, p. 90.

<sup>23</sup>William O. Johnson, *All that Glitters is not Gold* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1972), p. 58.

<sup>24</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1929," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 13 (July, 1929), 8.

<sup>25</sup>Eyquem, p. 282.

<sup>26</sup>Mayer, p. 155.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>28</sup>The memorial site and stele at Olympia were viewed on several occasions by the writer.

<sup>29</sup>Mayer, pp. 25-26.

<sup>30</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Prague, 1925," p. 14.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., Vienna, 1933, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., Athens, 1934, p. 8.

<sup>33</sup>Mayer, p. 143.

<sup>34</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1936," p. 3, Aug. 15.

<sup>35</sup>Karl Ritter Von Halt, "Letter to the Editor," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 51 (August, 1955), 35.

<sup>36</sup>Andre G. Poplimont, "Berlin 1936," *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 55 (October, 1956), 46.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>Ritter von Halt, p. 35.



<sup>40</sup>Avery Brundage, "Why the Olympic Games?" *Report of the United States Olympic Committee, 1948* (New York: United States Olympic Committee, 1948), p. 21.

<sup>41</sup>Mayer, p. 138.

<sup>42</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 59.

<sup>43</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1946," p. 1.

<sup>44</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 60.

<sup>45</sup>Mayer, p. 93.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 208.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 211-212.

<sup>50</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1953," p. 17.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>52</sup>Philip Goodhart and Christopher Chataway, *War Without Weapons* (London: W. H. Allen, 1968), p. 14.

<sup>53</sup>Henry, p. 128.

<sup>54</sup>Robert Shapen, "Profiles: Amateur," *The New Yorker*, 36 (July 25, 1960), 52.

<sup>55</sup>Avery Brundage, "Letter, 1953," in *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques*, Otto Mayer (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 244.

<sup>56</sup>Richard D. Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), p. 72.

<sup>57</sup>Shapen, p. 62.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

<sup>60</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," p. 9.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.



<sup>63</sup>Mayer, pp. 303-306.

<sup>64</sup>Arthur Daley, cited in "Profiles: Amateur," Robert Shapen, *The New Yorker*, 36 (July 25, 1960), 30.

<sup>65</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, p. 9.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 21.



PART III

ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE  
IN PURSUIT OF OLYMPISM 1894-1970





## CHAPTER 9

### ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE RELATIVE TO OLYMPISM

In a 1908 speech entitled "'Trustees' of the Olympic Idea," Pierre de Coubertin stated clearly that the role of the I.O.C. was not one of:

. . . issuing strict regulations, which it were intended to make compulsory . . . . We do not trespass upon the privileges of the sport associations; we are not a council for technical policy. We are simply the "trustees" of the Olympic idea.<sup>1</sup>

His explanation of the motives of the I.O.C. followed:

The important thing in life is not victory but struggle; the essential is not to have won but to have fought well. To spread these precepts is to prepare the way for a human race which will be at once braver and stronger, and more scrupulous and generous. These are the ideas which dominate our group.<sup>2</sup>

At that time the I.O.C. was still directly involved in technical decisions relating to the operation of the contests of the Olympic Games. As his speech suggested, this was not a result of an I.O.C. desire to retain such control, but rather was necessitated by the lack of I.F.s (in some sports) and the lack of comprehensive rules and regulations for the direction of sport meetings. As soon as such organizations and rules came into effect, the I.O.C. relinquished to the I.F.s its technical function for the Olympic competitions.

The planning of the total Games festival had never been in the hands of the I.O.C. Even for the first Olympic Games of 1896 in Athens, a local organizing committee had been established to supervise and co-ordinate all aspects of the festival. Except for the dual membership



of some I.O.C. members in organizing committees, if the games were to be held in their country, the I.O.C. has never taken active part in the preparations for the Olympic Games.

The I.O.C., therefore, was intended to be, and has become the policy-setter for the Olympic Movement, concerning itself with translating philosophy, principles, and goals into action guidelines for those who would undertake the tasks of preparing Olympic contestants and competitions.

In the early years of the Olympic Movement, few definitive regulations were established by the I.O.C. As the Games grew in size and complexity, more and more policies were written into the rules. The first extensive increase in the rules seems to have occurred in the early 1920's, as the 1924 publication of rules was far more wide-ranging than were the 1920 rules.

It is noteworthy that by this time Coubertin was beginning to loosen his firm hold on the direction of the I.O.C. by creating the Executive Committee in 1921. The combination of this action with the appearance of more trenchant rules a few years later suggests that Coubertin had lived by his 1908 statement denying the issuance of "strict regulations," but that other members of the I.O.C. were more disposed toward clearly established controls.

If, as Coubertin maintained, the role of the I.O.C. was that of "Trustees of the Olympic Idea" or "Olympism," then the actions of the I.O.C. since its founding should all have been directed to this end. The promotion and defence of this philosophy should have been the intent which motivated all policy decisions. Since Olympism has been described



as containing the factors of amateurism, physical and character development, internationalism, and aesthetics and arts and letters, the work of the I.O.C. must be analysed according to these factors in order to determine to what degree the "trusteeship" function was discharged.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 9

<sup>1</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen (Lausanne: Carl-Diem Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966), p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.





## CHAPTER 10

### ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD AMATEURISM

#### Introduction

The most persistent problem facing the I.O.C. since its inception has been amateurism. From 1894 to 1970 about 75 per cent of the I.O.C. General Assemblies have contained discussions involving amateurism, either as the central topic or as a side issue to some other agenda item. This percentage might possibly be higher as some of the Minutes, particularly in the early years, are missing or contain only sketchy reports. Between the two World Wars every one of the 22 meetings considered the amateur problem, except the 1919 session--the first one held following the end of World War I. Since World War II, only seven of the 31 sessions have not deliberated on the problem.<sup>1</sup>

Over the years different facets of the qualities of amateurism have received attention by the I.O.C. and world sporting groups. The emphasis changed with the changes in the societies from which the athletes came. In the early period of I.O.C. activity, the difficulty centred on determining a basic definition. The word amateur, used to describe the qualification of the athlete permitted to participate in the Olympic Games, had been accepted by the Congress of Paris in 1894, but that explanation of the practical application of the word was never officially included in I.O.C. rules. Although a rather lengthy definition appeared in the I.O.C. Minutes of its 1911 session, the text was only provisionally accepted and was not incorporated into the Olympic



rules.<sup>2</sup>

During the 1920's, specific elements of the amateur dilemma became more important, the most prevalent being discussions of payments to the athletes for salary lost during competition periods. Other amateur problems considered at this time were the position of sport teachers, the awarding of prizes at non-Olympic events, and early concerns about expense money.

It was 1927 before any true description of amateur status was printed in the Olympic rules. Until that time, the amateur statement gave the power of defining the amateur exclusively to each I.F., and the 1927 declaration continued this practice; however, it was accompanied by a more specific explanation under the heading "Necessary conditions for representing a country."<sup>3</sup>

After World War II, the areas of contention revolved around subsidized training periods for athletes and the increase in the use of Olympic competitors for commercial ventures. The Olympic definition of amateur seemed to become more general in 1949, when the rule was changed to incorporate a more philosophical statement of the amateur quality, but continued to allow the right of setting regulations to the I.F.s.<sup>4</sup> The 1958 rule book reverted to more precise instructions by adding a section entitled "Decisions of the International Olympic Committee" which interpreted the amateur rule (Rule 26) statements.<sup>5</sup> In 1966 a new version of the Olympic rules expanded the official interpretation of Rule 26 to three printed pages under the heading "Rules of Eligibility for the Olympic Games."<sup>6</sup>



## Olympic Congresses

The I.O.C. was not the only group attempting to translate the amateur spirit into definitive, word-bound rules, although it was the leader of such efforts. Each I.F., soon after its formation, made it a major issue for deliberations. In addition, the I.O.C., in an endeavour to obtain agreement by all the organizations involved with the Olympic Games, held a series of congresses to discuss various difficulties facing Olympic sport, including the problem of obtaining an amateur definition. The Congresses of Paris (1913), Lausanne (1921), Prague (1925), and Berlin (1930) brought together the representatives of N.O.C.s and I.F.s with many I.O.C. members. The first two congresses merely noted that each I.F. was to determine amateurism for its own adherents.<sup>7</sup> The Congress of Prague supported this relegation of authority, but added the clauses relative to the prohibition of professionals and of compensation for lost salaries, as set out in the 1927 rules.<sup>8</sup> These statements were confirmed by the Congress of Berlin five years later.<sup>9</sup> After 1930, no further Olympic congresses were held<sup>10</sup> in spite of apparently pressing needs for closer co-operation among the I.O.C. and the N.O.C.s and the I.F.s. Although on several occasions a few N.O.C.s made requests to the I.O.C. for congresses, surveys of all N.O.C.s and I.F.s seemed to result in a general lack of interest, so the I.O.C. took no action. Certainly the I.O.C. appeared reluctant to convene such conferences without strong pressure from both the other two organizations. There were fewer calls for congresses after the inauguration of annual meetings of the I.O.C. Executive Board with I.F.s and with N.O.C.s. These meetings often included amateurism on



the agendas. The Executive Board then reported the expressed attitudes and suggestions of these groups to the I.O.C. General Assemblies.

### Amateurism in the Early Years

The I.O.C. has paid lip service to the amateur concept without always enforcing those rules--whether meagre or extensive--which have existed ever since the re-establishment of the modern Olympic Games in 1894. The Congress of Paris which made the decision to re-institute the Olympic cycle of Games was ostensibly called to discuss the problem of defining amateurism. Its recommendations on the topic appear to have been wholly ignored by the fledgeling I.O.C. Certainly Pierre de Coubertin was not very satisfied with the results and those definitions of amateurism never became part of the Olympic eligibility rules, because the 1896 I.O.C. meeting judged the Congress of Paris definitions to be too strict.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the first two Olympic Games of 1896 and 1900 contained special contests for professionals in the fencing program, and the winners were awarded Olympic medals.<sup>12</sup> Coubertin was not happy with the inclusion of professionals in the Games and insisted that attention should be focussed on the amateur competitions.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, allowing some professionals to compete suggested that the amateur problem, although of concern to some, had not yet developed into the contentious issue it was to become in later years. If the I.O.C. members as a group had held adamant convictions about the amateur purity of the Olympic Games contestants, no doubt the professional fencing contests would have been prohibited. It must be noted that the professional competitors were apparently fencing "masters" or teachers.





This, plus the fact that fencing was an upper-class sport, may have influenced the élite I.O.C. to accept professionals in this particular case. However, 1900 was the last time such athletes were purposely allowed in the Games.

The first comprehensive opportunity to attack the problem of the amateur definition following the 1894 Paris Congress, came at the 1905 Congress of Brussels which included non-I.O.C. participants, although organized by the I.O.C. Unfortunately, the delegates avoided the topic. Mayer claimed that Coubertin felt the congress was "intimidated by this enterprise"<sup>14</sup> of further attempts to formulate a definition of amateurism. The congress evidently had no legislative power: ". . . the resolutions of the congress being more like wishes."<sup>15</sup> Quite possibly the congress ignored such a thorny problem because it was aware that no one was bound to accept its decisions.

The earliest internal effort by the I.O.C. to identify a definition of amateurism for the Olympic Games came as the result of a report presented by Count Albert de Bertier (France) to the annual session of 1909.<sup>16</sup> While the Minutes did not include any details, they did show that the Count made "four cardinal points . . . money, contacts, professorship, and the connection of the athlete with the sport group to which he belonged."<sup>17</sup> His comments and recommendations were not reported, but the Minutes stated, "The radicalism of certain conclusions of the reporter [Bertier] frightened some members of the Committee."<sup>18</sup> Consequently, it was decided to have three members of the I.O.C. (Cook, Sloane, and Musza) prepare a report based on a questionnaire soliciting the opinions of the "Sport Federations" in the British



Empire, America, and continental Europe.<sup>19</sup> Mayer commented that this was the first time the problem was shelved.<sup>20</sup>

In order to facilitate a more cohesive treatment of the I.O.C.'s promotion and defence of amateurism as part of Olympism, the various factors dealing with amateurism have been separated into the following specific topics for individual scrutiny:

Broken Time Payment

Teachers and Instructors of Sport

Expense Money

Value of Prizes and Gifts

Athletes Turning Professional

Commercialism of Athletes

State Amateurs

#### Broken Time Payment

The phrase "broken time payment" refers to compensation paid to an athlete to replace income lost when he is unable to work during training periods and/or competitions. This has been one of the prime points of dissension between the I.O.C. and the I.F.s throughout the history of the modern Olympic Games.

In 1910 a survey of the views on amateurism of the Sport Federations was conducted in many countries and the results were sent to two committees to determine if unique definitions of amateurism for certain "categories of sports" could be drawn up. Two British members, Courcy-Laffan and T. A. Cook, were charged with examining the possibilities for track and field athletics.<sup>21</sup> The other committee was to study



fencing, but no results of their deliberations have been uncovered. At the 1911 meeting, Laffan proposed a rather comprehensive definition of amateurism for track and field, including a statement on broken time. It was noted in his report that an amateur may not at any time have "received directly or indirectly any bonus or payment as compensation for loss of time while competing in or training for any athletic competition."<sup>22</sup> The Minutes stated that the total definition would likely become law for athletic sports (track and field) after 1912,<sup>23</sup> but it was never printed in the Olympic rules. Nevertheless, approval of such a severe position made it very clear that the I.O.C. could see no need for the rule of amateurism to be structured to allow the athlete to gain recompense for salary loss incurred during training and/or competition.

Apparently the subject was not broached again until the meeting of 1923. At that time, Edström (Sweden) questioned the legitimacy of indemnities given to athletes as salary compensation for the time lost during participation in international competitions. Laffan (Great Britain), who had presented the 1911 broken time prohibition, cautioned the I.O.C. to think carefully of the democratic attitudes of the times and the changing views on amateurism, possibly implying a concern for athletes of lower socio-economic classes.<sup>24</sup> Montu (Italy) agreed that the I.O.C. must not legislate in a manner contrary to these social changes.<sup>25</sup> A more conservative opinion was expressed by Kentish (Great Britain), who suggested that working men who wished to take part in the Games without losing their amateur status should arrange to coincide their annual vacation with the dates of the contests.<sup>26</sup> Musza (Hungary)



noted that training time must be remembered.<sup>27</sup> President Coubertin ended the discussion by declaring that a long study, focussing upon the definition of "amateur" and the question of broken time payments, was to be undertaken at the 1925 Prague Congress.<sup>28</sup> When Edström insisted that a rule must be enounced before the 1924 Games of Paris, a sub-committee was named to study the problem.<sup>29</sup>

Later in the same session the sub-committee reported its conclusions:

At the 1923 session of the International Olympic Committee the question was raised of the legitimacy of payment of an indemnity (for training and participation in the Olympic Games) to the athlete who, by reason of his situation as family support, cannot give up his salary during this period. After a lengthy discussion the sub-committee has concluded that, the basis of the Olympic Games being respect for the principles of amateurism, the payment of this indemnity does not appear admissible.<sup>30</sup>

Despite this direction, even the gentleman speaking for the sub-committee asked that the question be discussed at the Congress of Prague to be held in 1925. Thus, the Olympic Games of Paris must have been held under the broken time regulations of each federation.

At the 1924 meeting, among other questions relative to amateurism, two points concerning broken time payments were proposed, and were to be sent by the I.O.C. to the Prague Congress of 1925 for deliberation:

10. Must compensation received for lost salary be considered as an indirect material benefit derived by the athlete from the practice of sport?
11. Must this compensation be paid directly to the athlete or to his employer to compensate him for the detriment caused by the absence of the employee to whom he continues to pay wages or salary? Must this compensation be paid for the training period or only for the period of participation in the Games?<sup>31</sup>

The importance of the answer to question 10 lay in the fact that at the same meeting the I.O.C. had also agreed to send to the congress the





following proposal distinguishing between amateur and professional:

"amateur" is one who receives no appreciable material benefit from sport and is prepared to so declare by oath; . . .

"professional" is one who receives material benefit, directly or indirectly, from the personal practice of sport.<sup>32</sup>

At the 1925 I.O.C. meeting held during the three days preceding the opening of the Prague Congress, the statement was changed slightly to read:

An amateur is one who devotes himself to sport for sport's sake without receiving directly his means of existence.

A professional is one who receives from the practice of sport all or part of his means of existence.<sup>33</sup>

On the topic of broken time, a range of attitudes was exposed in the comments of the attendant members. Laffan (Great Britain) felt that "an unbending position would only arouse class hatred by depriving poor youth from participating in the Olympic Games, because they would fear leaving their families in financial need."<sup>34</sup> He agreed that strict control was necessary but insisted that the principle of compensation was legitimate. Edström (Sweden) considered that this would be "'crossing the Rubicon' because once the barrier is dropped between amateur and professional it would not be possible to replace it."<sup>35</sup> A suggestion that compensation be allowed only for the Olympic Games was made by Clary (France).<sup>36</sup> The text finally adopted as the I.O.C. position was: "Compensation for lost salary is considered as an indirect material benefit."<sup>37</sup> In effect, the I.O.C. was recommending to the congress that broken time payment be forbidden.

The congress decisions allocated to each I.F. the responsibility for the definition of an amateur, but required compliance with the minimum rules which it stated.<sup>38</sup> With reference to broken time, point



(b)--under the heading "Amateurism"--established that "Those who have received compensation for lost salaries" would not be admitted to participate in the Olympic Games.<sup>39</sup> This statement subsequently appeared in the 1927 rules as printed in the official I.O.C. bulletin.<sup>40</sup>

Conflicting reactions to this rule arose early. The International Federation of Football, while agreeing in principle with the declaration of the Congress of Prague<sup>41</sup> admitted "limited payment for 'broken time'" to its players.<sup>42</sup> The Football Federation argued that some employers would give a man leave with pay in order to compete in meets while others would not. To ensure that all players had equal opportunities to compete, the man losing his salary must be compensated by the national federation. Such action, however, would deny amateur status to the compensated athlete while allowing the player with the considerate employer to remain amateur.<sup>43</sup> The Football Federation, therefore, changed its rules to allow payment directly to the employer so that the athlete never touched any of the compensation in the process of the transaction. When the Executive Board of the I.O.C. was informed of this move it did not object to the alteration of the Football Federation rules, even though the Prague Congress decision was contravened, and it allowed football to be on the program of the up-coming 1928 Amsterdam Games.<sup>44</sup> It was not until the 1928 I.O.C. meeting in Amsterdam that some members of the I.O.C. challenged the right of the Executive Board to make a decision contrary to the Prague Congress Rules. The president declared that the Football Federation's point (payment of compensation directly to the employer) was a "new fact" that had not been debated at Prague, and that the Executive Board had,



therefore, "agreed to the inclusion of Football in the IXth Olympiad, as an exceptional case."<sup>45</sup> A sub-committee was struck to look at the problem and at several proposals, with the resulting motion that:

. . . the F.I.F.A. has modified its views of amateurism in such a way that they are not in accordance with the Olympic Rules . . . [and that] unless they [F.I.F.A. and another federation] alter their rules so as to conform with the principle of qualification of the I.O.C. voted by the Congress of Prague . . . those sports can not be included in the Olympic Programme.<sup>46</sup>

The motion was carried unanimously<sup>47</sup> and football was omitted from the Olympic Games program at Los Angeles in 1932.<sup>48</sup>

Although the 1929 I.O.C. meeting did nothing more constructive on the topic of broken time than to affirm "once more the principles of amateurism which is the very basis on which Olympism has been built . . . "<sup>49</sup> some comments made by President Baillet-Latour are informative. He said:

. . . it was absolutely necessary to define in clear terms exactly what was meant by the expression "broken time" and "holiday with salary paid," the first being forbidden and the latter quite legitimate according to the present rules of qualification for the Olympic Games.<sup>50</sup>

Immediately following the I.O.C. session, the Executive Board met with representatives of the I.F.s at which time Baillet-Latour made a statement which clarified the beliefs of many of the I.O.C. members on broken time:

. . . the I.O.C. was absolutely opposed to the idea of countenancing the permanent practice of payment for "broken time" as it was contrary to the spirit of Amateurism, the fatal consequence of which was to encourage the young man to find a means of existence by means of his sport that was less fatiguing and more glorious than working.<sup>51</sup>

The continuing concern with the broken time issue was evident in a speech by Baillet-Latour delivered at the opening of the Berlin



Congress of 1930. His text dealt mainly with this topic and entreated the congress to find some solution to the quandry.<sup>52</sup> Unfortunately, no progress was made as the congress simply reiterated the statutes devised by the Prague Congress five years previously.<sup>53</sup> The Berlin Congress did, however, delegate the task of defining "leave with salary paid" to the Executive Board of the I.O.C. and to the "Consultative Council of the I.F.s."<sup>54</sup>

The two groups named undertook to settle the question at a joint meeting in October, 1930, following the congress. Their answer was to add an interpretation to the Prague and Berlin statements which had declared that, in order to participate in the Olympic Games, an athlete "must not have received reimbursement or compensation for loss of salary."<sup>55</sup> The interpretation added:

A holiday given under the normal conditions of the business or the profession or a holiday accorded under the same conditions on the occasion of the Olympic Games, and provided that it does not lead to a reimbursement for lost salary, direct or indirect, does not come within the provisions of [previously quoted] #2.<sup>56</sup>

After making the above pronouncement, Otto Mayer said, "Dear readers, if you understand it, we lift our hat to you."<sup>57</sup>

The next mini-crisis involving the concept of broken time erupted at the 1934 I.O.C. meeting when Baillet-Latour informed the session that the Football Federation had eliminated from its regulations all definitions of amateur and statements on broken time, and had left the decisions on these questions to each national federation.<sup>58</sup> The I.O.C. evidently accepted this action with little discussion.<sup>59</sup> Mayer suggested that:

The I.O.C., faced with a fait accompli and probably not





desiring to eliminate this sport from the program of the Games because it was one of the principal sources of revenue for the Organizing Committees, decided that these definitions established by the national federations would be accepted as definitions of amateur with the same claim as those emanating from the International Federations. Of course, they must conform to the definitions of the I.O.C. applicable to the Olympic Games.<sup>60</sup>

This would seem to be the first major crack in the wall that the I.O.C. built to guard against broken time payments. In 1928 when the Football Federation was permitted to continue in the Olympic Games program--even though it had changed its amateur rule in a way that did not conform to the Prague Congress dictum--the I.O.C. had considered that it was an interim situation and that the projected Berlin Congress would deal with it. Now, however, there was no guarantee of another congress being held as none was planned for the future. Possibly, the I.O.C. suspected that it would be easier to deal with each national federation of football individually than with the I.F. who controlled the total group. Refusing entry into the football contests of the Games to one or two countries would not mar the total presentation of a sport which drew excellent gate money.

Football was again admitted as an Olympic sport for the Games of 1936 when the Football Federation promised that the teams taking part would be "exclusively composed of players who have not touched broken time payments."<sup>61</sup> This action suggests that the Football Federation was willing to conform to the I.O.C. rules for the Olympic Games even though its rules for other competitions allowed broken time.

Although the conflict about broken time payment had focussed on football, it was not the only sport affected by this aspect of the amateur rules, but the Football Federation was the first I.F. to



challenge the Prague and Berlin Congress proclamations, even if it did appear to capitulate in order to participate in the 1936 Games at Berlin.

At the 1936 meeting, cycling supported football by requesting the I.O.C. to abolish the prohibition against broken time compensation.<sup>62</sup> The I.O.C. failed to comply and in 1937 the Cycling Federation requested that the agenda of the next congress include the problem of broken time. Again, the I.O.C. refused, noting that it could see no purpose in convening a congress since it felt there was no reason to modify the existing rules. As long as a large number of I.F.s remained faithful to the statutes, changes were unnecessary.<sup>63</sup> The very fact that the I.O.C. seemed willing to accept the faithfulness of a "large number" of I.F.s rather than all of them indicated either a weakening of their resolve or a disinclination to disqualify recalcitrant federations. However, the I.O.C. refusal to re-open the topic for discussion could suggest that they would rather have partial compliance to the broken time rule than to offer an opportunity for its complete elimination.

A perfect example of the bewilderment which must have been extensive at that time was revealed at the 1938 I.O.C. meeting in Cairo when the broken time problem did, indeed, come up again, introduced by an I.O.C. committee. At Warsaw the previous year a sub-committee had been established to study the existence of pre-Olympic training camps in some countries.<sup>64</sup> When the report (in "question-response" format) was presented in 1938, it was obvious that much more than training camps had been examined: two questions referred to broken time:

9. Are the N.O.C.s or clubs authorized to make financial



arrangements with an employer, in order to assure the participant of being re-employed after an absence for an international competition?

Response: Participation in the Olympic Games must be considered as a very great honour.

This attitude is held by most employers who are proud to have an Olympic athlete as an employee. Therefore, there is no need to make financial arrangements for the athletes.

Supplementary allocations greater than the normal salary are a violation of the Olympic rules of qualification.

10. Can an indemnity be paid to the wife, mother or father of an athlete, during his absence, if he is the sole support of his family?

Response: In exceptional cases, and after a private inquiry, a payment equal to his entitled allowance given directly to the employer, is not considered a reimbursement for lost salary.<sup>65</sup>

Mayer made a cogent comment on the foregoing confusion: "They refused to admit broken time while authorizing it in particular cases. Does not such action open the door to exaggerations?"<sup>66</sup> The report was received and the ensuing discussion resulted in a most astonishing action. The I.O.C. decided to ask the Executive Board and the I.F. delegates,

. . . to look for means of avoiding future incidents which will discredit the Olympic Games and sport in general, by decisions appearing contrary to good sense and fairness.<sup>67</sup>

This would suggest that the I.O.C. seemed fully cognizant of the weakness of its rule but was hoping to convince the I.F.s that their images would be damaged by any confrontations with the I.O.C.

When the I.O.C. revived its work following World War II, one of the first actions was to constitute a committee to look at the amateur problem. The results appear to have been new rules, agreed upon at the Stockholm meeting of 1947. The material was not incorporated in the



daily Minutes because it had been circulated to the members before the sessions, and it was not attached as an appendix. Printed in the rule book of 1949, the new rules gave a general and idealistic definition of an amateur, specifying that the athlete must have pursued his sport "without material gain of any kind direct or indirect . . ." and reiterated the required accord with the I.F. rules.<sup>68</sup> The previous statements on broken time were deleted. Evidently the I.O.C. considered that the inclusion of the phrase referring to "material gain" would cover the subject, as it appears to have made this rule more restricting than the previous one. However, as salary loss was not mentioned, the new regulation may have been freer than the Berlin Congress statement. Undoubtedly, some people thought so, as in 1954 a speaker claimed: ". . . in 1947 at the time of the Stockholm session the principle of broken time had been admitted by the I.O.C."<sup>69</sup> It could very well be true that the absence of the words "loss of salary" was the condition that convinced some people to interpret the rule as admitting broken time, although the I.O.C. had no such intention.

The two decades from 1950 to 1970 must have been a puzzling time for all whom the I.O.C. amateur rule touched. It appears that the intent of the 1947 rule was to prohibit compensation for broken time, but that, as it was not so spelled out, many sportsmen seemed to have misinterpreted the rule.<sup>70</sup> Certainly in 1954 President Brundage was not of the opinion that broken time payments should now be permissible. The I.O.C. meeting Minutes reported:

Mr. *Brundage* . . . thinks that the indemnity for broken time should be forbidden, he knows however, that certain members do not share his views . . . [he] lays emphasis on the fact that the whole





situation rests with the N.O.C. and that it is up to them to see that everything should be as correct as possible. We have done our duty and he fails to see how we could do more.<sup>71</sup>

In 1957 it was decided to add an informative note to the "Definition of an Amateur" to assist sport organizations in making proper applications of the rule. The section, entitled "Decisions of the International Olympic Committee," contained absolutely no mention of broken time,<sup>72</sup> and must have been highly encouraging to those who advocated recompense for salary loss; but this reading of the regulation was misleading as the I.O.C. still disapproved of broken time payment.

The confusion was evident at the session in 1960 when Albert Mayer (Switzerland) felt it necessary to make a vigorous protest about the amateur statutes. Mayer strongly supported relaxing the amateur rule to reduce the hypocrisy he believed was being created by the stringent regulations which it seemed impossible to live up to under modern conditions. With reference to broken time, he contended that the I.O.C. "ought to permit reimbursement of salary which represented *no gain* since it gives the athlete what he has lost."<sup>73</sup> A committee was struck and charged with producing a report the following year.<sup>74</sup> At that time a new rule was passed<sup>75</sup> which affected the broken time controversy in that the definition of amateur appeared to be broad enough to allow recompense for lost wages.<sup>76</sup> Certainly, receiving indemnity for lost salary was not noted as a forbidden action.

However, this deficiency was corrected in 1962 at the I.O.C. meeting in Moscow when the "Eligibility Code" was adopted as a guide to the understanding of the amateur rule.<sup>77</sup> The subsequent 1966 printed



rules contained the approved material. Although Rule 26 (amateur rule) did not seem to forbid broken time payment, the new additions which interpreted the rule contained this statement:

The International Olympic Committee in principle is opposed to payments for broken time which it considers an infraction of Olympic amateurism.

However, when a competitor can prove that his dependants are suffering hardship because of his (or her) loss of salary or wages while attending the Olympic Games, his National Olympic Committee may make a contribution to those dependants, but under no circumstances may it exceed the sum which he (or she) would have earned during his (or her) actual period of absence, which in turn must not exceed 30 days.<sup>78</sup>

The next major development occurred when the International Football Federation proposed a new set of amateur rules to the I.O.C. who were satisfied with them "except where it concerns the payment of lost salary, a practice authorized by this federation and forbidden by us."<sup>79</sup> On this topic, the Football Federation regulation stated:

Those who take part under the jurisdiction of their national association and receive an allowance for wages lost may also be considered to be amateur players. Such allowance must be an equitable proportion of the actual wages of the player which have been lost. Players who receive regular wages . . . are considered to be professionals . . . .<sup>80</sup>

This explanation indicated that full reimbursement for lost wages must not occur, but even so, the I.O.C. was not happy with the diversion from its rules.<sup>81</sup>

These circumstances were a partial cause of new studies on the situation. The responsibility was given to a Standing Commission on Eligibility and to a Joint Commission II (Eligibility) composed of both I.O.C. and N.O.C. members.<sup>82</sup> This latter commission submitted its report in 1969 wherein it analysed the problems of amateurism in the



modern society and discussed realistic attitudes. Some of the phraseology was unusual, but this may have been due to the Rumanian background of the commission chairman, and the assistance of Rumanian sportsmen and researchers in preparing the report. There was no question that these gentlemen fully supported broken time compensation:

III.8. A high performance athlete who is also an employee reserves the right to receive from the community the wage he had when he left production.<sup>83</sup>

However, this was not a universal right, as the following qualification indicated:

IV.2. Athletes who have the necessary material means to practice high performance sports or the freedom of option as to the way in which they obtain their income (free professionals, fund holders, housewives, etc.) are not entitled to compensation for lost income.<sup>84</sup>

Unfortunately, this ambiguous observation was nowhere rendered into a clear statement.

The report then continued with a new text for the Eligibility Code, based on the earlier analysis:

5. Those employed [Olympic competitors] can receive from the part of the community they represent the equal amount of the wage they had when they were relieved from production, for the whole period of their training for and participation in the Olympic Games.<sup>85</sup>

This communication was immediately passed on to the Standing Commission on Eligibility who considered it, combined the acceptable sections with their own work, and in 1970 recommended payment for broken time in "hardship" cases only:

. . . for a period of preparation determined by the respective International Federations and approved by the International Olympic Committee and for the period of attendance at the Olympic Games, a National Olympic Committee may authorize compensation payments in cases of hardship through loss of salary or wages suffered because



of the competitor's absence during these periods.<sup>86</sup>

A decision was tabled until the next session in 1971. The rule extant in 1970 remained the one that had been instituted in 1962 and printed in the 1966 rule book.

### Teachers and Instructors of Sport

Since the first day of its existence, the I.O.C. has been entangled in arguments about the status of sport and physical education teachers in relation to amateurism. Although the Congress of Paris manifesto was not fully accepted by the I.O.C.,<sup>87</sup> the former had taken the unequivocal position that an amateur was one "who has never been, at any period of his life, paid as a professor or coach of physical exercises."<sup>88</sup> The Olympic Games of 1896 and 1900 numbered fencing teachers among the competitors in special events for professionals. This permission was written into the recommendations of the Congress of Paris Commission for the Olympic Games which had established the conditions for their re-institution: "IX. That, except for fencing, Olympic competitions are organized only for amateurs."<sup>89</sup>

The report on amateurism made by Count Albert de Bertier at the 1909 I.O.C. meeting included "professorship" as one of the "four cardinal points."<sup>90</sup> (see also f.n. 17, p. 217). The committee named to study his conclusions reported in 1911 that amateurs may not have, at any time,

B.a) received any pecuniary consideration for the teaching of or assisting in any athletic exercise.

b) accepted appointment to any salaried post on the consideration, expressed or implied, of taking part in, assisting in or teaching any athletic exercise, the taking part in, assisting in or teaching





of which does not form part of the normal duties of such post.<sup>91</sup> The notation about "normal duties" presaged future attempts to resolve the problem. The committee recommendations were never printed as official I.O.C. rules.

During World War I, the I.O.C. ceased to meet and it was 1924 before the teacher dilemma was again tackled. As the I.O.C. was convening an Olympic Congress for Prague in 1925, at which the representatives of the I.F.s and N.O.C.s would be present, the 1924 General Assembly dedicated much time to drawing up a list of questions to place before the congress. Several items referring to the classification of teachers were prominent:

- 5. Are there grounds for distinguishing between the teacher and the professional? (By teacher is understood one who teaches a sporting exercise for material recompense.)
- 6. Are there grounds for making a distinction between teachers who instruct sports to amateurs and those who work with the education of professionals?
- . . . . .
- 8. Can a teacher be an amateur in the sports that he does not teach?
- 9. Can the teacher who permanently retires from teaching a sport be re-instated as an amateur in that sport?<sup>92</sup>

Item 9 certainly presupposed the answers to the previous questions. The I.O.C. also provided the congress with a suggestion for a basic distinction between the amateur and the professional with the professional being designated as one who "receives material benefit, directly or indirectly, from the personal practice of sport."<sup>93</sup>

This attitude, of course, affected the disposition of the teacher's situation. At the General Assembly held immediately prior



to the Prague Congress, the I.O.C. undertook to clarify its beliefs. As it had done with the problem of broken time, the I.O.C. included some radicals who wanted to "protect teachers who perform their duties with devotion from exclusion from the amateur ranks."<sup>94</sup> Coubertin recalled that "personally he had never ceased to protest against the identification of the teacher as a professional and that for his part, he would never admit it."<sup>95</sup> Despite Coubertin's vigorous opposition, the I.O.C. voted to accept this recommendation:

It is not forbidden to make a distinction for participation between the teacher and the professional, but the first is always acceptable to be on Committees and Juries. It is understood by teacher the one who instructs in a sport for material recompense.<sup>96</sup>

This appears to be a purposely confusing statement. The Prague Congress pronouncement clarified the position slightly but even it could have been the source of arguments on interpretation:

4. Trainers, Advisors, Instructors and Coaches who teach competitive games for money directly or indirectly can neither take part in the Olympic Games nor serve as Judges or members of the Juries. Professors or Teachers who do not specially train or teach competitive sports and exercises may take part in the Games and serve as Judges and Members of the Juries.<sup>97</sup>

However, the latter proposal was never added to the Olympic rules which, since 1924, had delegated responsibility to the I.F.s for amateur interpretations.

For the next ten years, a hiatus existed concerning arguments about sport teachers and amateurism. However, in 1935 the International Federation of Skiing adopted an action that placed skiers in the forefront of the battle against the designation of teachers as professionals. From this juncture on, skiing was to be the focus of I.O.C. attention on the issue. The 1935 meeting received information that the Skiing



Federation had decided to approve for international competition ski teachers who received money for the job. The I.O.C. action was to have the president write to the Skiing Federation "drawing attention to the fact that the teachers of skiing receiving pay are not qualified to take part in the Olympic ski events which are reserved for amateurs."<sup>98</sup>

The 1936 Winter Games evidently progressed smoothly as far as the eligibility of skiers was concerned, so it could not be determined which position was operative for the competitions. However, at a Skiing Federation meeting during the Winter Games at Garmisch-Partenkirchen it was decided to participate in the Winter Games of 1940, "only . . . if the dispositions of the Rule of International Competition of the F.I.S. are applied."<sup>99</sup> This apparently meant they would participate only if ski teachers were admitted to Olympic competitions. Five months later at the 1936 Berlin meeting, the I.O.C.'s only response was to reiterate its Oslo stand rejecting ski instructors as amateurs.<sup>100</sup>

During the Berlin I.O.C. meeting, the Skiing Federation received some support from the gymnasts. The International Federation of Gymnastics had established a definition of an amateur which, in future, authorized gymnastic teachers to take part in organized competitions, thereby including the Olympic Games. The Executive Board was instructed to discuss the situation with the Gymnastics Federation, but the I.O.C. made it clear it intended to remain faithful to strict amateurism.<sup>101</sup>

The Gymnastics Federation president attended the 1937 meeting of the I.O.C. where he re-affirmed the federation's intention to adhere to the eligibility rule which it had presented to the Berlin meeting.



The format of the Gymnastics Federation rule as stated at that meeting accepted as amateurs those school teachers who instructed elementary gymnastics either as part or all of their job.<sup>102</sup> Edström (Sweden) proposed a new rule which had the appearance of being a compromise. He suggested that "One who spends the greatest part of his time and draws his principal revenue from teaching sport is not allowed to take part in the Olympic Games."<sup>103</sup> There was no recorded vote on this motion, but the Minutes of the I.O.C. observed: ". . . the Committee, on the subject of teachers of gymnastics, thinks that only teachers who instruct elementary gymnastics as well as other branches of the school curriculum are amateurs from the Olympic viewpoint."<sup>104</sup> This stance certainly demonstrated that a shift from the position taken by the original Congress of Paris observations of 1894 had occurred in the ensuing forty years.

Ski instructors posed a problem similar to that of the gymnasts, later in the same session, resulting in an addition to the existing rules which disqualified teachers. The amendment asserted that athletes not eligible for the Olympic Games were:

Those who are paid teachers of physical education and sport, except for those who give elementary instruction in physical education and sport only as accessory activities to the normal program of studies.<sup>105</sup>

The change was of little assistance in solving the deadlock caused by the Skiing Federation's threat to abstain from participating in the 1940 Games if its rules allowing teachers to take part were not accepted. The I.O.C. broke the stalemate at its 1938 meeting by eliminating skiing from the 1940 Olympic Games program.<sup>106</sup> As tennis and football





had been denied entry in the 1932 Olympic Games due to conflict over the amateur rule, so now skiing was confronted with the same fate. The situation was saved by the intervention of World War II and cancellation of the 1940 Games.

The first item of business on the agenda of the 1946 I.O.C. General Assembly, after election of the president and vice-president, was the topic of the differences with the Skiing Federation. Two members of the Skiing Federation executive were present to propose a compromise solution, agreed to by the general session of the Skiing Federation in the preceding month. They proposed that the past unpleasantness between the Skiing Federation and the I.O.C. be forgotten, that skiers who had been teachers be re-instated if they did not teach in future, and that from October 1, 1946 the Skiing Federation would conform to the I.O.C. amateur rules. The I.O.C. seemed only too happy to approve such an agreement.<sup>107</sup>

Prior to the arrival of the Skiing Federation representatives, an interesting point was made in the I.O.C. discussion of the ski situation, which shed additional light on the federation's action back in 1935. This was to the effect that the whole dispute had centred around the skier who taught occasionally, not full time.<sup>108</sup> No mention of this fact was found in any of the Minutes which reported the progress of the conflict from 1935 until the 1946 meeting.

As for the amateur status of teachers in *all* sports, the 1937 decision which established a differentiation between the teacher of sport *per se* and the teacher of a variety of school subjects including sporting skills was eliminated in 1947. This resulted in the lone



existing rule which identified the amateur as a person to whom "participation in sport is nothing more than recreation without material gain of any kind direct or indirect and in accordance with the rules of the International Federation concerned."<sup>109</sup> It would appear that even part-time teachers receiving remuneration for instruction given would be ineligible for the Olympic Games under this rule and that the gymnastic teacher situation was well covered by the use of the word "indirect."

A new section entitled "Decisions of the I.O.C." was added to the rule book in 1958 with the intent of clarifying aspects of the amateur rule. It disqualified only "those who have been paid for training or coaching others for organized sport competitions."<sup>110</sup> However, as the "direct or indirect material gain" statement still remained in Rule 26, there was no improvement in the status of teachers.

The 1966 rule book instituted a "Rules of Eligibility" section and, under the sub-heading "Other decisions," added: "An athlete paid for teaching elementary sport (beginners or school children) on a temporary basis without abandoning his usual occupation remains eligible."<sup>111</sup> The inclusion of the phrase "on a temporary basis without abandoning his usual occupation" seems to have prohibited even the full-time professional school teacher who instructed sports only for a portion of his time.

That attitude was modified in the new rule proposals made in 1970. Although the report of the Joint Commission II (Eligibility) at Warsaw in 1969 had nothing specific to say about teachers, the Standing Commission on Eligibility made it clear, at the 1970 meeting, that some



teachers could be Olympic participants:

8. Physical Education teachers may teach beginners without losing eligibility as Olympic competitors.<sup>112</sup>

A prime example of the occasional inconsistency of the Olympic rules followed the above statement, on the next page, under the heading "Competitors may accept":

- E. Payment for teaching elementary sport to beginners or school children providing they do not abandon their usual vocation.<sup>113</sup>

The gradual relaxation of attitudes toward the amateur status of teachers which had occurred from 1894 to 1937 apparently was consciously turned back by the 1966 rule which was repeated in the 1971 version of the eligibility regulations, because no decisions had yet been made on the current efforts to amend the rules. However, if the recommendations to be voted on at the 1971 I.O.C. session were to be accepted, the trend would have been reversed, allowing Olympic eligibility to physical education teachers of beginners.

#### Expense Money

The source of money to pay for the expenses incurred by the athlete for his competitive experiences has been a problem involved in the amateur discussion from the outset of the I.O.C. Basically, expense money is taken to mean travel, accommodation, food and pocket money. In later years, expenses for special training also became an issue.

The amateur statements emanating from the Congress of Paris in 1894 allowed no expense money to be paid directly to the athlete. Gate money could be shared between the sport societies represented at the



meet (to be used for travel expenses) but none was to go to the athlete:

- IV. That gate money can be shared as compensation for travel between participating societies but never between the competitors themselves.<sup>114</sup>

This article still left much doubt as to whether the athlete was allowed to be reimbursed by his society for his travel costs. It might have been interpreted that transportation tickets were purchased by the sporting society so that the athlete was never required to have the money in his possession.

The sub-committee named in 1910 to confer with the I.F.s on the topic of an amateur definition reported to the 1911 General Assembly of the I.O.C. in Budapest. The sub-committee's proposal was accepted provisionally for "athletic" sports only, but it offered an example of I.O.C. thinking about expense money: that amateurs were persons who had not at any time:

- b) received money or pecuniary benefit in consideration of their taking part in any athletic competition, exhibition or performance.

(Nota Bene) The payment of the actual out of pocket traveling and hotel expenses of a competitor by the club which he is selected to represent does not involve forfeiture of his amateur status under this clause.<sup>115</sup>

The proposal never became part of the rules governing the amateur standing of athletes in athletics (track and field) or any other sport.

In 1920 pocket money was discussed at the annual I.O.C. meeting, wherein it was noted that the problem could be "a danger to amateurism . . . [but it must be remembered] . . . that some athletes are rich and some poor."<sup>116</sup> However, no action was taken at that session.





In the following years, an interesting dilemma faced the I.O.C. Los Angeles, when applying to host the Olympic Games of 1924, had proposed to cover the costs of transporting athletes from Europe to Los Angeles, as the I.O.C. was concerned about the expenses incurred by holding the Games in the U.S.A. In a 1921 press communication, the I.O.C. declared that this idea refuted "the superior principles of amateurism."<sup>117</sup> This pronouncement certainly emphasized the I.O.C.'s position that such financial aid was detrimental to amateur purity, even though the source was the Los Angeles Organizing Committee and the support would apply to all athletes from Europe. However, when the Games for 1932 were awarded to Los Angeles the question arose again. In 1929, Garland (U.S.A.), when giving his report on the preparations for the 9th Olympic Games, said that the organizing committee "can't possibly cover the entire cost of transporting the athletes, and in any case it would not be good from the amateur point of view."<sup>118</sup> Edström (Sweden) replied that "the reduction of fares is not contrary to the spirit of amateurism."<sup>119</sup> This sequence of events suggested that there were differences of opinion among the I.O.C. members and that, by 1929, partial elimination of travel costs might be acceptable but full payment was not. Brown (Canada) offered to assist in negotiations with steamship organizations to obtain reduced fares, and the president agreed: " . . . any attempt to reduce the costs for athletes will have no effect on their amateur standing."<sup>120</sup>

In preparation for the Prague Congress of 1925, which was to bring together representatives of N.O.C.s and I.F.s with the I.O.C., the latter recommended the following in connection with expense money:



An amateur has the right for reimbursement of the cost of his travel and maintenance abroad to participate in the competitions for a period not exceeding 15 days per year per sport unless he is designated to represent his country in the Olympic Games.<sup>121</sup>

Evidently the Prague Congress did not agree to remarks about expenses as the topic was not included in the list of "Decisions."<sup>122</sup> It is possible that the intent of the recommendation was so obscure as to discourage the Prague delegates from tackling it. At that time, the rules made no direct reference to expense money, so it must be assumed that the Prague Congress was content to leave the decision to each I.F. The Berlin Congress of 1930 had nothing to add relative to expense money, and again this item remained the prerogative of each I.F.

In 1933, the International Amateur Athletic Federation drew up a series of proposals, that could be adopted by all I.F.s, in an effort to combat semi-professionalism. These articles were subsequently accepted unanimously by the I.O.C. for circulation to the I.F.s, but did not become a part of the Olympic rules. The observations relating to expense money were quite detailed:

2. All payments of the competitor's actual expenses must be made not to the competitor but to the Federation of his own country.
3. Reimbursement for actual travelling and other expenses of the competitor shall be given, as far as possible, not in cash but in kind, by the provision of tickets, lodging, etc. . . .
4. An amateur must not accept or in any manner receive any money or other pecuniary gain in going to, attending or returning from a sports meeting other than his actual outlay for travelling, meals and lodging. Under no circumstances shall the amount paid or accepted for expenses exceed one second-class railway fare, (including sleeping accommodation) or one first-class steamship accommodation, and one pound (gold) or the equivalent per day for meals and lodging.<sup>123</sup>

Obviously, the I.F.s and the I.O.C. were willing to support payment of



an athlete's expenses but they were extremely careful that he should gain no financial advantage. The timing of this epistle is most interesting when it is recalled that Pavo Nurmi was prohibited from participating in the 1932 Games for accepting expense money in excess of his actual costs.<sup>124</sup>

A new concern surfaced in 1937 when a committee was named to investigate the incursion of nationalism into the Olympic Games.<sup>125</sup> In the committee's deliberations, the financial support of the athlete was considered. The report submitted to the 1938 General Assembly of the I.O.C. was prepared in a question-response format, and one item tackled training camps. Although mentioned previously in I.O.C. meetings, no position on training camps had been established by the I.O.C. until this time:

2. Study of the practice of preparing athletes for the Olympic Games in training camps.

In case this practice is admissible, how many times can it be tolerated without being an infraction of the Olympic rules?

Response: The practice of interrupting the athlete's occupation (studies or work) to put him in a special training camp for a period longer than 2 weeks is not in accordance with the idea of the Olympic Games.<sup>126</sup>

Also approached was the question of pocket money as extra to food and lodging expenses:

8. What sum can be allowed to an athlete as pocket money?

Response: An athlete can receive reimbursement of normal sums paid by him such as: laundry, bus, tram, etc., etc., on condition that it does not exceed three shillings a day.<sup>127</sup>

Neither of these responses was incorporated into the rules.

The issue of expense money paid to competitors caused no overt disturbances for some years. However, in a 1955 speech on the amateur



problem, Brundage asserted:

One can cite several examples illustrating in what manner the rules of the amateur statutes are violated: non-authorized payments are made to competitors to cover their expenses, . . . athletes are shirking their regular employ or their studies several weeks for special training or competition and during this time they receive subsidies of commercial agencies, cultural institutions or governments.<sup>128</sup>

Again the topic was tabled to a future meeting.

The newly published rules in 1958 contained the fore-runner of the "Eligibility Code," the clarification of the amateur Rule (Rule 26), under the heading "Decisions of the I.O.C."<sup>129</sup> A search of the Minutes provided no information as to when this code was accepted or how it was designed. However, Mayer revealed that this was decided at the 1957 I.O.C. meeting, and he included a part of the text, which is almost identical with that printed in the 1958 rule book.<sup>130</sup> The code explained the I.O.C. attitude to both expense money and training camps at that period:

## 2. Training Camps

The practice of interrupting the occupation of an athlete (studies or employment) to put him in a camp for athletes for over two weeks for special training is not in accord with the ideals of the Olympic Games.<sup>131</sup>

It must be noted that this statement is essentially the same as that produced by the committee in 1938, but the 1958 material was printed in the rules as an interpretation of Rule 26. The item referring to expense money described ineligible competitors:

## 6. The following are not eligible for Olympic competitions:

. . . . .

- d) Those who have accepted for expenses reimbursement in excess of the actual outlay.<sup>132</sup>

The 1962 rule book contained an extension of training camp time





from two to three weeks, and, after a discussion at the 1964 Tokyo General Assembly, the period was lengthened to one month.<sup>133</sup>

In 1966, the revised version of *Olympic Rules and Regulations* covered the question of financial support of the athlete while training and competing, in a first appearance under the heading "Among others, the following are not eligible for Olympic competition":

\*

Those who have received payment of expenses in excess of the actual outlay.

\*

Those whose occupation (studies or employment) had been interrupted for special training in a camp for more than four weeks in any twelve-month period.

\*

Those who have received expense money for more than 28 days exclusive of the time taken in travelling, in any one calendar year. Extensions may be given under exceptional circumstances by their international federation to cover competitions against another country, or in the Olympic or Regional Games.<sup>134</sup>

A separate sub-section titled "A competitor is permitted to receive" seemed to duplicate some of the above information while outlining more specifically certain types of expenses:

Travelling and living expenses corresponding to the actual outlay during competition, including the Olympic Games, and for a very limited period of training (no more than four weeks), subject to approval of his National Olympic Committee.

\*

Clothing and equipment as required for practicing his sport from his amateur sport organization.

\*

Pocket money to cover daily expenses during the Games but only from his National Olympic Committee.<sup>135</sup>



At the 1969 I.O.C. General Assembly, the Joint Commission II (Eligibility) reported some most interesting observations. In the preamble to its recommendations, the commission made a cogent point which had been the crux of the arguments on expense money, training camps, and even broken time payments for many years. The report asserted:

III.2. The interpretation of the rule of eligibility should clearly differentiate the idea that the community should *partially alleviate* the athlete's sacrifices he willingly does, from the idea of the *material profit* which could be obtained by the respective person using sport as a means for increasing his standard of living.<sup>136</sup>

Identifying in more detail the types of support which the athlete should have the right to expect, the report continued:

III.7. The interpretation of the rule of eligibility should allow the sportsman of high performance [to] receive material assistance within the proper limits in view of his training for and participation in the Olympic Games (lodging, food, transport, sport equipment, sport installations and materials, coaches, physicians, cultural-artistic requirements). The material assistance should be granted with the observance:

- it should come from or through the intermediary of the sports collectivity the athlete belongs to;
- it should be granted in kind;
- it must not imply [on] the part of the athlete compromises of an ethical nature.<sup>137</sup>

The new rule drafted by the commission, which was given following the above material, incorporated all these ideas into the suggested rules. Despite this, the recommendations of the 1970 Standing Commission on Eligibility changed the 1966 rules in only two respects. First, the restriction on time spent in training was to be established by each I.F. and approved by the I.O.C.--no precise time limit was stated. Second, the athlete was also permitted to receive insurance payments. Decisions on the proposals were to be made at the 1971 General Assembly.



The trend in financial assistance to the athlete moved from a highly restricted situation legalizing only a few types of expenses to one where almost the only expectation was that the expenses must be legitimate and that the athlete must not receive material assistance more than for actual costs. As to training camps, it appeared that they were never forbidden even though they were not "in accord with the ideals of the Olympic Games." In addition, the time permitted for athletes to spend in training camps grew from two weeks to a month.

#### Value of Prizes and Gifts

Prizes as competitive awards have caused trouble within the I.O.C. from the time of the Congress of Paris. The difficulties were not within the Olympic Games themselves, since the award of medals for victors was the Olympic solution, but the amateur status of athletes who received cash or valuable prizes in competitions outside the Olympic Games was called into question. An allied quandry was the increasing tendency for grateful nationals or governments to present expensive gifts to outstanding performers.

In 1894 the Congress of Paris approached prizes early in their series of decisions about the amateur definition:

- I. Will be considered as an amateur in athletics: All persons who have never . . . competed for a prize in kind or for a sum of money of whatever source it comes, notably from gate receipts . . . .<sup>138</sup>

The then current tendency of converting prizes into cash was no longer allowed.

- III. That the one who procures money by means of the prizes he has won loses his amateur status.

That the value of art objects not necessarily be limited but



that this value not reach, in general, a very high amount.<sup>139</sup> The discussion included attempts to limit the monetary value of prize goods but the congress, declining to be involved to such a degree, merely indicated its desire that prizes "be only a souvenir and not recompense . . . ,<sup>140</sup> as sufficient discouragement. Point VI of the decisions mentioned cash prizes again in a special context:

VI. That the tendency of all sports, without exception, be toward pure amateurism, no permanent grounds existing in any sport to legitimate cash prizes but concerning competitions of equestrian, shooting and yachting, the general definition of amateur temporarily not be applied.<sup>141</sup>

Supporting this point of view was the knowledge that these sports incurred large expenses on the part of the participant.<sup>142</sup>

The next attempt to clarify amateur status came in 1909 when Count Bertier presented what was evidently considered to be a rather radical approach, resulting in the appointment of an I.O.C. committee to study the problem. Although the 1911 findings of the committee referred to "athletics" only, they apparently represented rather accurately the attitudes of the I.O.C., who provisionally accepted the text, hoping it would become "universally accepted":

All persons shall be considered amateurs for the purposes of the Olympic Games who have not at any time:

A.a) competed at an athletic meeting for a money prize or for monetary consideration . . . . .

d) sold or pledged any prize won in any athletic competition.<sup>143</sup>

It should be noted there was no proscription against a non-money prize of whatever value, except that such must not be sold. These proposals were not incorporated in the I.O.C. rules, nor as a matter of fact, were prizes mentioned in I.O.C. rules until 1958. In the interim, the





congresses and various committees seem to have ignored the topic. For example, although the 1925 Prague Congress ruled on several aspects of amateurism, there appeared to be no concern with prizes and gifts.

Again, in the battle against semi-professionalism waged in 1933, the recommendations from the I.O.C. to the I.F.s did not mention prizes.<sup>144</sup>

While the award of prizes to winners of non-Olympic competitions in some sports had continued over the years, and occasionally comments had been made in I.O.C. meetings, no action was taken. Shooting and equestrian events were particularly guilty of this indiscretion. In 1935 an agreement was reached with the Shooting Federation that competitors who had accepted no prizes in kind since August 1, 1934 would be authorized to participate in the Berlin Games.<sup>145</sup> At this same meeting a declaration was agreed to which mentioned gifts to successful athletes, but it was not inserted into the rules:

The I.O.C., having learned that prizes in kind, under different forms, have been constituted as recompense to the athlete who accomplishes a sport performance, asks the N.O.C.s not to distribute such prizes and draws their attention to the fact that the athletes who receive them lose, ipso facto, their amateur status. If prizes of this type have already been established, they can be returned to the Federation who could utilize the funds for development of sport in general.<sup>146</sup>

The issue of gifts was tackled by the Warsaw committee whose findings on amateur topics were submitted to the I.O.C. (1938) in a question-response format:

3. Are Olympic Games winners who have received gifts from their governments to be admitted to the Games again?

Response:

"Participants who have received money gifts or material advantages will not be admitted to the Olympic Games."<sup>147</sup>



In spite of this, the rules still contained no statement specifically referring to prizes or gifts.

By 1953 the number of occasions when athletes received valuable gifts from governments or the public had increased to a point causing concern. At the meeting of the I.O.C. Executive Board with the N.O.C. representatives that year, President Brundage stated: "this problem is being submitted to the Delegates' appreciation with the object of establishing a rule."<sup>148</sup> The Brazilian delegate considered that Article 38 of the rules should be sufficient to stop the practice as it explicitly stipulated "that an athlete infringes the rule of Amateurism if he derives from the practice of sport a material gain either direct or indirect."<sup>149</sup> A few days later, in an attempt to strengthen its position, the I.O.C. "unanimously agreed to forbid the remittance of presents to athletic winners." This decision was to be sent to the N.O.C.s and the I.F.S.<sup>150</sup>

Brundage's 1955 "amateurism" speech charged that "valuable gifts and prizes of excessive value are distributed and accepted."<sup>151</sup> The result may have been a statement in the "Decisions of the International Olympic Committee" section which was added to the rule book in 1958. This section of the rules must have been approved by the I.O.C. before the printing, but no discussion on it can be found in the Minutes. However, Mayer mentioned that, at the 1957 I.O.C. meeting, "it was decided to add an informative note in the Rule book to permit a better interpretation of the amateur rule by responsible organizations."<sup>152</sup> The material he gave as an example compared almost exactly with the text of the section which appeared in the 1958 rule book. Attention was paid to



gifts and prizes:

6. The following are not eligible for Olympic competitions:

- a) Those who have participated for money, for merchandise prizes easily converted into money, or, without permission of the National Federation within the rules of the International Federation concerned, for prizes exceeding 40 Dollars in value, and those who have received because of their sport performances, valuable presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.<sup>153</sup>

Despite the detailed "forbidden" activities, the I.F.s of yachting, equestrian sports, and shooting continued to present victors with cash prizes in competition outside the Olympic Games. In 1966 Brundage reported that he had written to the three I.F.s, but only the yachting I.F. had responded, agreeing to discontinue the practice of awarding cash prizes.<sup>154</sup>

A Joint Commission II (Eligibility) composed of members (see fn. 82 for composition of the commission) of the I.O.C. and N.O.C.s presented a report in 1969. The initial proposals on amateurism were subsequently dealt with several times before they became part of the Eligibility Code of the Olympic rules but the original suggestions are most interesting because of their terminology. The language was highly suggestive of the socialist background of the committee chairman. On the topic of prizes and gifts, the report recommended:

III.9. Social collectivities should reward high performance athletes, offering them within proper limits sports articles, art objects or things for personal use. These should be established by the rules of the international sports federations. A list of these kinds of offerings should be kept by the national federations and by the sports club and controlled by the National Olympic Committees.<sup>155</sup>

This suggestion evidently was rejected by the I.O.C., as the rules published in 1971 reiterated the 1958 pronouncement with only minor



changes:

*Among others, the following are not eligible for Olympic competition:*

Those who have participated for money, or who have converted prizes into money or, without permission of the National Federation within the Rules of the International Federation concerned, have received prizes exceeding 50 Dollars in value, and those who have received presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.<sup>156</sup>

From the Congress of Paris to the 1971 rule book the I.O.C. remained opposed to amateur athletes receiving prizes or gifts of any great value.

### Athletes Turning Professional

The opportunity for the Olympic athlete to turn his sport prowess into a professional career was not prevalent in the early years of the Olympic Games. Few competitive sports were organized into spectator endeavours sufficient to generate incomes that could provide a man's livelihood. Boxing was the major exception, but some other sports such as rowing were deeply into stake competitions. That the Congress of Paris was ostensibly called to discuss the growing dangers of professionalism to amateur competition was evidence of the increasing numbers of sportsmen involved, if not as pure professionals, at least as quasi-amateurs. As the Olympic Games gained wider prestige and fame more interest was shown by the public in paying to see the athletic performance of former Olympic medal winners.

The earliest concern about using the Olympic Games as preparation for a professional career apparently surfaced in 1921. At the I.O.C. General Assembly that year there was a long discussion about Olympic champions who turned professional. Laffan (Great Britain) was concerned





about the "Olympic Games becoming a nursery for professionals."<sup>157</sup> Gautier-Vignal (Monaco) wondered if "the names of the culprits could be erased from the victor list or be marked by some sign."<sup>158</sup> A suggestion to include in the athlete's oath a promise to remain amateur was proposed by Clary (France).<sup>159</sup> Merrick (Canada) contended that it was up to the N.O.C.s to take effective measures, as they saw fit, to control the situation.<sup>160</sup> Another speaker believed that too much emphasis on this issue could be a sort of advertisement for professionalism.<sup>161</sup> President Coubertin felt that the problem would increase unless the English definition of amateur, which equated teachers with professionals, was renounced.<sup>162</sup> The latter comment suggests that the most common form of professional opportunity at that time was obtaining sport teaching positions. The subject was dropped from the discussions and the new Executive Committee was directed to consider what actions the I.O.C. might take.<sup>163</sup>

In 1931 the problem reappeared, this time identified with a specific individual. The newspapers had reported that Sonja Henie, the 1938 figure skating gold medallist, intended to turn professional after the Olympic Winter Games of 1932. This knowledge disturbed the I.O.C., and President Baillet-Latour warned that "if she intended becoming a professional, it would be better if she did not take part in the third Winter Games."<sup>164</sup>

Although there must have been an increasing number of athletes who took up professional careers after achieving Olympic glory, the topic does not appear to have been mentioned between 1931 and 1955. At the I.O.C. meeting in 1956 President Brundage made reference to "Those



amateurs who only awaited to be classed in the Games in order to sign contracts as professionals."<sup>165</sup> His original comment had been made in a letter to the Organizing Committees of Cortina, Melbourne, and Stockholm wherein he asked them to remind N.O.C.s of the widespread criticism that non-amateurs were being allowed to participate in the Olympic Games. Brundage suggested that permitting such persons to perform in the Olympic Games was the fault of the N.O.C.s who sent the entries.<sup>166</sup> A new set of rules had just been printed, and they included a drastic attempt to prevent the future professionalism of Olympic competitors by requiring the athlete to sign the following statement: "I, the undersigned, declare on my honour that I am and intend to remain an amateur and fulfil the conditions stipulated by the Olympic Rules."<sup>167</sup> The furor caused by this change, particularly in the United States, induced the Executive Board "to suspend the application of this rule for the 1956 Games and operate under the old rule without the words 'and intend to remain.'"<sup>168</sup> Brundage commented on the problem and possible solutions:

The four words were added to help the National Olympic Committees eliminate those who did not belong in the Games. It was generally recognized by all rules that a person who intends to become a professional is no longer an amateur. The new rule is weak because you can intend to do something today and quite honestly change your mind tomorrow. In any event, the International Olympic Committee has no desire to deal with individual athletes. It can however withdraw recognition from National Olympic Committees and it can eliminate sports that are not amateur from the program of the Games.<sup>169</sup>

The rules published in 1958 omitted those four contentious words and they never reappeared.

When the 1958 section of the rules titled "Decisions of the International Olympic Committee" appeared, in an effort to delineate more clearly the application of the "Definition of an Amateur" (Rule 26),



it contained a passage relative to future professionals, stating that athletes were "not eligible for Olympic competitions . . . who have decided to become professional athletes and are participating to enhance their commercial value."<sup>170</sup> This interpretation should have been difficult to enforce because an athlete might well have claimed that his participation purpose was pure and had no connection with his decision to turn professional.

The I.O.C. implemented the rule after the Olympic Winter Games of 1964 in Innsbruck. The silver medallists in pair figure skating, Bäumlér and Kilius, had their medals called back "when they were held to have infringed Olympic rules by signing a professional contract before the Games."<sup>171</sup> Brundage advised the 1966 I.O.C. session that the medals had been returned and would be redistributed to the next placings. When Brundage discovered how many of the skating medallists had turned professional, the Minutes reported his comments:

This example demonstrates clearly how very much certain sports are imbued with professionalism. Mr. Brundage considered that the dignity of the Olympic Games is gravely impaired when they are reduced to the role of a steppingstone on the way to a professional career. Sports that have openly passed over to professionalism should no longer be on the programme of the Games.<sup>172</sup>

The rules of 1966 expanded the 1958 dictum by describing the non-eligible athlete to be:

An athlete who becomes a professional in *any* sport or who has decided to become a professional or who plays in a professional team with a view to become a professional. (In the opinion of the International Olympic Committee, this rule should have general observance.)<sup>173</sup>

The bracketed comment would suggest that the I.O.C. realized most of their rules would be obeyed only for the Olympic Games, but it believed



this regulation should apply to amateur sport of all types and levels.

The Joint Commission II (Eligibility) at the 1969 I.O.C. meeting apparently agreed with the existing declaration in the rules as it suggested no changes.<sup>174</sup> The 1971 rule book contained the same statement but deleted the bracketed comment.<sup>175</sup>

### Commercialism of Athletes

Commercial opportunity for athletes, resulting from their performance achievements, is a relatively recent phenomenon. Professionalism and commercialism differ in that the former means the athlete sells his skills as a performer whereas the latter means the athlete sells his fame and reputation, usually to the field of advertising or, occasionally, to the film industry. The commercialism of Olympic champions has increased in direct proportion to the growth of the advertising industry; thus, the I.O.C. was not confronted with the problem until its fourth decade. The first mention of concern about commercialism occurred in the 1933 proposals of the Athletics Federation (track and field) on amateurism. The brief was presented during the meeting between the I.O.C. Executive Board and the I.F.s. The Athletics Federation made their disapproval of commercialism very clear:

7. An amateur cannot make use or capitalize his "Sports" fame. He cannot receive any compensation for using the goods or apparatus of any firm, manufacturer or agent, nor shall he allow his name to be used as a means of advertising or recommending the goods of any firm or manufacturer, nor shall he engage for financial benefit in any occupation or business transaction wherein his value arises chiefly from his "Sports" fame.<sup>176</sup>

As other suggestions to clarify the amateur quandry had been made at the same meeting, it was decided to condense the ideas into one report to





send to the I.O.C. General Assembly. When the resulting resolutions arrived at the I.O.C. meeting, the above quoted material was missing and no comments were added regarding commercialism.

In 1938 at Cairo a committee named to investigate nationalism in sport had included one area of commercialism in their report:

5. The position of sportsmen writing professionally.

Response:

In some countries athletes have found, thanks only to their sport performances, positions in various branches of commentary in theatre, in cinema or in broadcasting. This exploitation of a sport reputation is not in accord with the spirit of the Olympic Games.<sup>177</sup>

At this time the Olympic rules gave the right to define an amateur to the I.F.s, except to state that the athlete must not be or have been a professional.<sup>178</sup> Again, the I.O.C. appeared to ignore the article from the Cairo report and no specific rule was developed.

Even before he became I.O.C. president, Brundage called attention to the evils of commercialism in a circular letter to I.O.C. members:

Business is business and sport is sport. It is impossible to mix them . . . . Why should the I.O.C. and altruistic sport leaders contribute their time and money if the competitors are to be paid? Why should the competitors contribute their time and effort if others are to profit? . . . An athlete . . . who has decided to become a professional or one who is given extra pay in his vocation or for writing or radio announcing, is not an amateur and no juggling of language by any sport organization can make him one.<sup>179</sup>

It is noteworthy that advertising of products was excluded from Brundage's comment, whereas concern for athlete writers and broadcasters was voiced.

Again, in 1955, a Brundage speech called attention to



"competitors who exploit their sport reputation for personal profit,"<sup>180</sup> but still nothing was done about it.

A decision at the 1958 I.O.C. General Assembly, to add in the rules an explanatory note about advertising, was prompted by the headquarters receiving several reports of Olympic athletes allowing their photographs to be used for commercial advertising. The I.O.C. appeared to disapprove of this practice even if the payment went to the athlete's national sport federation.<sup>181</sup> The 1958 rules, therefore, contained two references to commercialism--both under the heading "Decisions of the International Olympic Committee." The first was part of a list of behaviours which would bar an athlete from Olympic competition:

- c) Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducements of any kind to participate. This includes those who have secured employment by reason of their sport performances, rather than their ability, in various branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema or Radio broadcasting.<sup>182</sup>

The second was a separate point under "Decisions . . .":

- 7. If a competitor is paid for the use of his name or picture, or for a radio or television appearance, in connection with commercial advertising, it is capitalization of athletic fame as described above. Even if no payment is made, such practices are to be deplored, since in the minds of many, particularly the young, they undermine the exalted position rightly held by amateur champions.<sup>183</sup>

When amendments to other sections of the rules were being proposed in 1960, a new paragraph was added to Rule 34 which concerned entries for the Olympic Games. The addition stated that "Nothing may be worn on the uniforms of contestants or officials at the Olympic Games, except the flag or emblem . . . ," and the I.O.C. must approve such insignia.<sup>184</sup> Andrianov (U.S.S.R.) attempted to make the



prohibition more specific by forbidding any "political or commercial slogan" on the uniforms, but Brundage thought the new text already covered that eventuality.<sup>185</sup>

At Tokyo, in 1964, an I.O.C. member suggested that athletes were becoming "sandwich-men" because of advertising on their jerseys and numbers. Up to that time, the Athletics Federation had not stopped the practice, provided the money earned went to a club or national sport federation.<sup>186</sup>

Slight changes in the wording of the statement relative to ineligibility, based on commercialism, were made in the 1966 rules. The alterations made it very clear that any hiring or promotion in rank in any paid activity, including the armed forces, because of sport achievement, would remove that individual's right to compete in the Olympic Games.<sup>187</sup>

Because of the popularity of skiing as a public recreation, this sport has always had great difficulties with athletes endorsing various makes of equipment, a major complaint of the I.O.C. against skiers for many years. In a 1969 report on the Olympic Winter Games, a step was taken to eliminate the personal gain a skier could obtain from this practice. Each national ski federation was to decide the make of skis to be used by all its team members and would make all the publicity arrangements. The Minutes observed that "This will avoid manufacturers dealing with the competitors and therefore prevent abuses."<sup>188</sup>

The report of the Joint Commission II (Eligibility) at the same session relaxed one facet of the commercialism rule, wherein Olympic



participants could receive:

3. Dues for articles, books, Radio and TV commentaries on sport themes which require on the part of those signing them or presenting them personal efforts for their elaboration.<sup>189</sup>

This part of the Joint Commission's report was ignored by the Standing Commission on Eligibility when it submitted its proposals the following year. The phraseology of the statement was different from the existing rule but the intent was identical.<sup>190</sup> The 1971 rules, therefore, were basically the same as those referring to commercialism in the 1962 rules.

#### State Amateurs

The term "state amateur" was coined after World War II to describe the Eastern Bloc athletes who, it was suggested, did little else but train for sports competition, with their respective governments bearing the expenses. The athlete appeared to receive a wage for the job he nominally held, although usually he spent only a token amount of time working. Many non-socialist countries contended that this was a form of professionalism, as the athlete's income depended on his sporting performance. They also argued that the practice escalated the political and nationalistic misuse of the Olympic Games. The socialist nations protested that, as no promoter was making a financial profit from the athlete's skill, it could not be classed as professionalism.

This issue appears to have arisen in a modest way the year following the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games. A committee was named to report on the "nationalization of sports in a political goal and practice of preparing athletes in national training camps."<sup>191</sup> The





combination of the two items in one investigation suggested a reflection of the German preparations for the Berlin Games. It also foreshadowed the state amateur condition. The committee took the position that national pride in successes could be exaggerated and that it was against the Olympic Ideal to train for more than two special camps.<sup>192</sup>

Passing comments on state amateurs were made at I.O.C. meetings and in speeches almost every year from the early 1950's onward. No action was taken until the 1962 rule book incorporated a section outside of the true regulations that indicated the existence of the state amateur problem, alluding also to scholarships and commercial sponsorship:

Individuals subsidized by governments, educational institutions, or business concerns because of their athletic ability are not amateurs. Business or industrial organizations, educational institutions or sponsor athletes, however, are not amateurs. Athletes who are given paid employment, or who receive special favours from governments occasionally adopt the same positions and are not amateurs. They also operate training camps for extended periods. Some colleges and universities offer outstanding athletes scholarships and inducements of various kinds. Recipients of these special favours which are granted only because of athletic ability are not amateurs.<sup>193</sup>

This statement is still retained in the Olympic rule book.

When a new eligibility rule was being drawn up in 1966, Brundage explained to the N.O.C.'s that the rule was needed to assist them in resisting pressures when forming their teams. He said that criticisms of the amateur status of Olympic athletes were principally threefold: (1) "State" amateurs; (2) Soldiers removed from duty for



intensive training; (3) Athletic scholarships given for physical skill.<sup>194</sup> Items 2 and 3 could, equally, be considered a type of state amateurism.

The change over the past fifty years in the status of high performance athletes may have engendered the greater concern by governments for the competitors' proper training. The preamble to the recommendations of the Joint Commission II (Eligibility) presented at the 1969 I.O.C. General Assembly made this concern very evident. The report included an analysis of the skilled athlete's role in society:

II.10. A high performance athlete has become today a social factor from whose activity the entire society benefits. His role is that of:

- a) a promoter of man's aspirations to self-improvement;
- b) an example of character and will-power of subordinating personal temptations to a moral aim, making great sacrifices to attain it;
- c) a factor of improvement of human relations, through the affirmation of the principles of loyalty in the contest and respect for his opponent;
- d) a propagator of physical exercises regularly practiced, a living example in this field;
- e) a messenger of peace, friendship and mutual respect among peoples;
- f) a subject for inspiration of literature and arts, of pride for the collectivity he belongs to;
- g) a factor of progress, a subject for biological research, a pilot-station for the study of the limits of human possibilities.<sup>195</sup>

If the foregoing is the world-wide image of the Olympic athlete, it is no surprise that more and more nations are treating him as a national resource and are delegating government funds for his training. However, for some years the I.O.C. rule books have included a warning against "Political Use of Sport." The text was almost a duplicate of the 1938 statement by the committee to study nationalism, and regretted that "certain tendencies exist which aim primarily at a national exaltation



of the results gained."<sup>196</sup>

### Comments on Changing Attitudes to Amateurism

The most noticeable characteristic of the changes made to the amateur rules from 1896 to 1970 has been the increasing detail in their presentation. The qualifications have grown from a simple statement that a competitor must be an amateur to four pages of interpretations and restrictions. Although the presidents of the I.O.C. have described the amateur status as being a "state of mind," the I.O.C. obviously felt the need to make it law. According to the I.O.C., it was necessary to clarify the meaning of amateur because of the variety of interpretations applied to the rule by both athletes and sport administrators.

Early in the history of the Olympic Games the responsibility for establishing the amateur qualification was given to the I.F.s. Gradually, as a result of disagreements between the individual federations and the senior body, more precise guidelines were developed by the I.O.C., although the rules continued to require adherence to the I.F. standards also.

If the 1894 Congress of Paris statements regarding amateurs may be considered typical of attitudes existing at that time, the trend in rule changes to 1970 can be traced. Some of the specific issues have been relaxed to a great extent. The type of expenses that may be underwritten by the N.S.G.B.s or N.O.C.s had been extended into areas either not mentioned or not considered necessary in 1894. Uniforms, equipment, and pocket money are now recognized as outlays that may be provided by



the athlete's sport organization. Training camps, unknown at the turn of the century, have struggled for acceptance and the I.O.C.'s position has been one of reluctant tolerance rather than of strong endorsement.

The question of sport teachers being allowed to compete in the Olympic Games is another example of loosening prohibitions, albeit limited ones. The classification of teachers and instructors as professionals was always an anathema to Coubertin. The more generous attitude which may have been motivated by him in the 1920's and 1930's was checked after World War II, if the later rules are construed strictly. However, loopholes in the regulations were possible and the 1970 recommendations would relieve the situation to some degree.

The lengthy and hard-fought battle against broken time payments has ended with the I.O.C. succumbing to the pressures of modern conditions while protesting such compensation as an infraction of amateurism. This is a case where the I.O.C. certainly has resisted the twentieth century social revolution and could be considered to have lost the struggle.

The other subjects dealt with under amateurism, although receiving greater attention by the I.O.C. in later years by the enunciation of more extensive statements, have remained as behaviours denounced by the I.O.C.

In 1971, the amateur rule really contained two sections. The first, Rule 26 entitled "Eligibility," was the statement requiring that all Olympic competitors must be amateurs and which included a brief "definition":

26. To be eligible for the Olympic Games a competitor must always





have participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind.

He can avail himself of this qualification:

- a) If he has a basic occupation designed to ensure his present and future livelihood;
- b) If he does not receive or has never received any remuneration for participation in sport;
- c) If he complies with the rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this rule (see Eligibility Code).<sup>197</sup>

The second section was the "Eligibility Code," and "official interpretations" of Rule 26, which covered all the topics discussed in this chapter and some additional, less controversial declarations.<sup>198</sup>

In summary, it is evident that the basis of all friction over the identification of amateurs and professionals hinges on the meaning given to "material gain." In some instances the I.O.C. appears to have categorized compensation for financial loss as being "gain," whereas athletes, sport federations, and N.O.C.s attempted to prevent any damage to the athlete's financial state, believing recompense is not "gain."

During Brundage's term as president there was little weakening of the I.O.C. position on amateurism. Two of his remarks in 1954 on this topic previewed the type of guidance he would give the I.O.C.:

. . . the author of these lines, in the course of nearly 50 years of experience, has never known or heard of an athlete who was too poor to compete in the Olympic Games.<sup>199</sup>

In a free world all men have the right of choice, but if he has made his choice he cannot then claim what he has lost by making the choice.<sup>200</sup>

A new president may well encourage, or at least, not impede, moderation of the amateur rule in the interests of modern standards.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 10

<sup>1</sup>Data obtained from analysis of all I.O.C. Minutes covering the years 1894 to 1970 inclusive.

<sup>2</sup>International Olympic Committee, "Minutes of the General Assembly: Budapest, 1911" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1911), as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 66 (June, 1911), 90-91.

<sup>3</sup>I.O.C., "Definition of an Amateur," and "Necessary conditions for representing a country" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 19.

<sup>4</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1949), p. 18.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 1958, p. 95.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 1966, pp. 43-46.

<sup>7</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Antwerp, 1920," p. 7, App. D; see also I.O.C., *Minutes of the Lausanne Congress 1921* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1921), p. 22.

<sup>8</sup>Czechoslovak Organising Committee [C.O.C.], "Decisions Voted by the Technical Congress at Prague," *Minutes of the Technical Olympic Congress, Prague, May 29-June 4, 1925* (Prague: Czechoslovak Olympic Committee, State Printing Office, 1925), p. 49; see also I.O.C. "Necessary conditions . . . [*. . . Regulations*], 1927, as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 19.

<sup>9</sup>I.O.C., "Resolutions of the Olympic Congress of Berlin," *Minutes of the Olympic Congress of Berlin 1930: IIIrd Year of the IXth Olympiad, May 25-30* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1930), p. 65.

<sup>10</sup>An Olympic Congress was held again in 1973 in Varna, Bulgaria.

<sup>11</sup>Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 44.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>13</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Paris, 1901," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, n.v. (July, 1901), p. 34.

<sup>14</sup>Mayer, p. 53.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*



<sup>16</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1909," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 42 (June, 1909), 90.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 91. [No explanation was given in the Minutes of the four points. It is likely that they referred to (a) obtaining money or goods for sport involvement; (b) competitive contacts with professionals; (c) the position of teachers of sport, and (d) relationships of the athlete with his society or federation.]

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Mayer, p. 59.

<sup>21</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Luxembourg, 1910," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 54 (June, 1910), 85.

<sup>22</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Budapest, 1911," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 66 (June, 1911), 90.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>24</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1923," p. 21.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., Paris, 1924, p. 16.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., Prague, 1925, p. 4.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.



<sup>37</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Prague, 1925," p. 5.

<sup>38</sup>[C.O.C.] "Decisions Voted . . . ," 1925, p. 49. The minimum rules were:

"The following will not be admitted to take part in the Games:

- a) Those who are or who have been knowingly professionals in their Sport or any other Sport.
- b) Those who have received compensation for lost salaries."

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

<sup>40</sup>I.O.C., "Necessary conditions for representing a country" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 19.

<sup>41</sup>Mayer, p. 123.

<sup>42</sup>I.O.C., "Meeting of Presidents of N.O.C.s with the Executive Committee of the I.O.C.," Amsterdam, 1928, as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 11 (October, 1928), 20.

<sup>43</sup>Mayer, p. 124.

<sup>44</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Amsterdam, 1928," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 11 (October, 1928), 15.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 17-18.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>I.O.C., *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux (Lausanne: The Committee, 1972), p. 41.

<sup>49</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1929," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 13 (July, 1929), 5.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>52</sup>I.O.C., "Opening of the Olympic Congress," *Minutes of the Olympic Congress of Berlin 1930, IIIrd Year of the IXth Olympiad, May 25-30* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1930), pp. 11-15.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., "Resolutions . . . ," p. 65.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.





55I.O.C., "Meeting of the Executive Committee and of the Council Delegates of the I.F.s, Paris, 1930," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 17 (March, 1931), 13.

56Ibid.

57Mayer, p. 130.

58I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1934," p. 8.

59Ibid.

60Mayer, p. 144.

61I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1935," p. 4.

62Ibid., Berlin, 1936, p. 2.

63Ibid., Warsaw, 1937, June 10, morning.

64Ibid., June 9, morning.

65Ibid., Cairo, 1938, 7th meeting, pp. 2-3.

66Mayer, p. 165.

67I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Cairo, 1938," 8th meeting, p. 1.

68I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, p. 18.

69I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1954," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 46 (July, 1954), 53.

70Mayer, p. 314.

71I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1954," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 46 (July, 1954), 53.

72I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, pp. 95-97.

73Mayer, p. 314.

74I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 63.

75I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1961," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 79.

76Ibid., p. 84, App. 5.

77I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Moscow, 1962," as reported in *Bulletin of*



the I.O.C., 80 (November, 1962), 49.

<sup>78</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1966, p. 45.

<sup>79</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 84.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 90, App. 7.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>82</sup>I.O.C., "Suggestions Concerning the Interpretation of Rule No. 26 of Eligibility," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 1, App. XV(a).

[The composition of the Joint Commission is interesting to note: Alexandru Siperco (I.O.C. Rumania), Sir Ade Ademola (I.O.C. Nigeria), Boris Bakrac (I.O.C. Yugoslavia), Eduardo Dibos (I.O.C. Peru), Cheik Gabriel Gemayel (I.O.C. Lebanon), P. Carroll (N.O.C. Ireland), Joergen Jahre (N.O.C. Norway), Jean Kies (N.O.C. Luxembourg), Epaminondas Petralias (N.O.C. Greece), Howard Radford (N.O.C. Canada), Luc Silance (N.O.C. Belgium.)]

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>85</sup>I.O.C., "Proposals Concerning the Alteration of the Official Interpretation of Eligibility Rule No. 26," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 12, App. XV(a).

<sup>86</sup>I.O.C., "Report of Standing Commission on Eligibility," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Amsterdam, 1970," p. 2, App. 16.

<sup>87</sup>Mayer, p. 44.

<sup>88</sup>[I.O.C.], *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 1.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 4, col. 3.

<sup>90</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1909," as reported in *Revue Olympic*, 42 (June, 1909), 91.

<sup>91</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Budapest, 1911," as reported in *Revue Olympic*, 66 (June, 1911), 90.

<sup>92</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Paris, 1924," p. 16.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., Prague, 1925, p. 4.



- <sup>95</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Prague, 1925," p. 4.
- <sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 7.
- <sup>97</sup>[C.O.C.] "Decisions Voted . . . ," 1925, p. 49.
- <sup>98</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1935," p. 6.
- <sup>99</sup>Ibid., Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 1936, p. 2.
- <sup>100</sup>Ibid., Berlin, 1936, July 30, p. 1.
- <sup>101</sup>Ibid., July 31, p. 1.
- <sup>102</sup>Ibid., Warsaw, 1937, June 9, p. 1.
- <sup>103</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>104</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>105</sup>Mayer, p. 158.
- <sup>106</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Cairo, 1938," March 16, p. 2.
- <sup>107</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1946," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 1 (October, 1946), 17.
- <sup>108</sup>Ibid., p. 16.
- <sup>109</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1949, p. 18.
- <sup>110</sup>Ibid., 1962, p. 96.
- <sup>111</sup>Ibid., 1966, p. 46.
- <sup>112</sup>I.O.C., "Report . . . Eligibility," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Amsterdam, 1970," p. 3, App. 16.
- <sup>113</sup>Ibid., p. 4, App. 16.
- <sup>114</sup>[I.O.C.] *Bulletin of the International Committee* . . . , p. 4, col. 2.
- <sup>115</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Budapest, 1911," p. 35.
- <sup>116</sup>Ibid., Antwerp, 1920, August 30, p. 1.
- <sup>117</sup>Ibid., Lausanne, 1921, p. 17.
- <sup>118</sup>Ibid., 1929, April 9, afternoon.



119I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1929," April 9, afternoon.

120Ibid.

121Ibid., Prague, 1925, pp. 5-6.

122[C.O.C.] "Decisions Voted . . . ," 1925, p. 49.

123I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 11.

124Richard D. Mandell, *The Nazi Olympics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), p. 40.

125I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1937," June 9, morning.

126Ibid., Cairo, 1938, March 17, pp. 1-2.

127Ibid., p. 2.

128Ibid., Paris, 1955, p. 72.

129I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 95.

130Mayer, pp. 277-278.

131I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 95.

132Ibid., p. 96.

133I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tokyo, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 89 (February, 1965), 75.

134I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1966, p. 44.

135Ibid., p. 45.

136I.O.C., "Suggestions . . . ," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 6, App. XV(a).

137Ibid., p. 7, App. XV(a).

138[I.O.C.] *Bulletin of the International Committee* . . . , p. 4, col. 1.

139Ibid., p. 4, col. 2.

140Ibid.

141Ibid.





<sup>142</sup>[I.O.C.] *Bulletin of the International Committee* . . . , p. 4, col. 2.

<sup>143</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Budapest, 1911," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, n.v. (June, 1911), 90.

<sup>144</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Vienna, 1933," p. 5.

<sup>145</sup>Ibid., Oslo, 1935, p. 5.

<sup>146</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., Cairo, 1938, March 17, p. 2.

<sup>148</sup>I.O.C., "Extract of the Minutes of the Conference of the Executive Committee of the I.O.C. with the delegates of the N.O.C.s," Mexico City, 1953, as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 39-40 (June, 1953), 41.

<sup>149</sup>Ibid.

<sup>150</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1953," p. 18.

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., Paris, 1955, p. 72.

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., pp. 277-278.

<sup>153</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 96.

<sup>154</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 86.

<sup>155</sup>I.O.C., "Suggestions . . . ," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 9, App. A4(a).

<sup>156</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, pp. 44-45.

<sup>157</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1921," p. 14.

<sup>158</sup>Ibid.

<sup>159</sup>Ibid.

<sup>160</sup>Ibid.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid.

<sup>162</sup>Ibid.

<sup>163</sup>Ibid.







<sup>184</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1962, p. 19.

<sup>185</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 62.

<sup>186</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tokyo, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 89 (February, 1965), 74-75.

<sup>187</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1966, p. 44.

<sup>188</sup>I.O.C., "Press Release," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," App. VI (b).

<sup>189</sup>I.O.C., "Proposals . . . ," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 12, App. XV(a).

<sup>190</sup>I.O.C., "Report . . . Eligibility," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Amsterdam, 1970," p. 2, App. 16.

<sup>191</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1937," June 8, afternoon.

<sup>192</sup>*Ibid.*, Cairo, 1938, March 17, pp. 1-2.

<sup>193</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 75.

<sup>194</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes [of] Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the representatives of the N.O.C.s, Kurhaus-Baden-Baden (Germany) October 15th 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 75.

<sup>195</sup>I.O.C., "Suggestions . . . ," I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," pp. 5-6, App. XV(a).

<sup>196</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 48.

<sup>197</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>198</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 44-48.

<sup>199</sup>Avery Brundage, Speech cited in *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques*, Otto Mayer (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 252.

<sup>200</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 251.



## CHAPTER 11

### ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD PHYSICAL AND CHARACTER (MORAL) DEVELOPMENT

Pierre de Coubertin's basic motivation initiating his life work for pedagogical sport and the Olympic Movement was a belief that sport participation increased physical health and influenced good character development (for further discussion see pp. 37-40). However, these values do not appear to have been utilized by I.O.C. members as reasons for their choice of actions. A conjecture might be made that I.O.C. support for these benefits was so universal they were taken for granted, and, therefore, were alluded to infrequently. Certainly, the discussions reported in the Minutes of the I.O.C. General Assemblies seldom mentioned these facets of Olympism.

The type of references to physical and character development found in the Minutes were highly idealistic statements professing the aims of the Games and of the I.O.C. An example occurred shortly after World War I when plans were being made for an Olympic Congress in 1921. The suggestion was made that representatives of sport associations should be invited to take part "in order to offer all youth a sporting education and the benefits of proper exercise to strengthen and develop them."<sup>1</sup> Probably what was meant was that having the sport associations involved at the congress could encourage their delegates to work harder at organizing sport so that the masses of people could participate and therefore reap the rewards of physical exercise.





During the Games of 1920 at Antwerp, a newspaper article criticized the I.O.C., quoting some countries and I.F.s as opposing I.O.C. control of the Olympic Games. A lengthy discussion ensued, the members debating what action the I.O.C. could take to clear up what it considered to be misconceptions. The decision was made to send a memorandum to the president of the I.F. that had been most critical, with copies to other I.F.s and N.O.C.s. In conjunction with other comments, the memo was to emphasize that the Olympic Games were "also moral and artistic manifestations."<sup>2</sup>

When the Paris Organizing Committee reported it was building an Olympic village for the 1924 Games, the I.O.C. supported the idea in principle, its motion including a phrase, "recognizing all the moral and technical advantages of such a plan."<sup>3</sup> The same I.O.C. meeting agreed to the establishment of a "Jury of Honour" at each Games to handle all complaints of a non-technical nature. The I.O.C. considered this action desirable for the greater "moral progress of sport."<sup>4</sup>

At the 1925 I.O.C. meeting, Count Penha-Garcia (Portugal) read a report on the "spread of the sporting spirit."<sup>5</sup> He believed that such promotion could occur "by teaching, example, the press, speeches, conferences and effective rules."<sup>6</sup> He proposed that the I.O.C. should ask the Prague Congress to,

. . . proclaim the need of "accenting by all means the spirit of loyalty, discipline, and *fair play* which must impregnate the practice of sport." Consequently, N.O.C.s, I.F.s and sport associations must be requested to inspire such attitudes. They are the moral foundations of the sporting life.<sup>7</sup>

Sherrill (U.S.A.) believed that it was the crowd who needed educating. The athletes behaved themselves well, but not the crowd. Coubertin



suggested drawing up a "commandments for sportsmen," and Laffan (Great Britain) agreed to undertake the project.<sup>8</sup> Eventually, the Prague Congress produced statements on sporting education and Laffan was the chairman.<sup>9</sup> The report first defined some terms, including "Sporting Spirit," by which it understood three combinations:

a)--of inner and outer truth--that is on one side the exclusion of lying, cheating, the will to deceive, and on the other side the effort to form a just idea of one's own faculties, and of the service one may render the group [to which he belongs: Team --Country--Humanity].

b)--the habit of fair play;

c)--of the chivalrous spirit which forbids one to ensure victory by taking advantage of an accident to an opponent, or of a moment of inattention on the part of the referee. That is the sporting spirit which must be spread.<sup>10</sup>

The second observation called upon all teachers and coaches of children to be "imbued with the same spirit."<sup>11</sup> To achieve this goal, the committee requested that all countries establish "sporting schools" where future teachers "would be called upon to bear in mind not only the technique of the different sports, but more especially the moral spirit which must inspire them."<sup>12</sup> Added comments (1) decried the possibility of finding any sport teacher who would encourage cheating; (2) recommended that teachers, in order to develop the child morally, should know them outside school; and, (3) accepted that such teaching would create "an atmosphere of truth, of comradeship, of sporting spirit . . . [that would make] . . . loyalty, honour and the respect of others"<sup>13</sup> fashionable. In order to educate adults, the committee felt that sport clubs should choose as directors only persons who have attended the special sports schools.<sup>14</sup> A third point was concerned with the role of the



press. The contents are so applicable to the media reporting of today that the whole text is worthy of inclusion here:

### 3.--Press propaganda

The Committee considers that the Press could play a much more important part than it does to-day in sporting education.

a)---By publishing from time to time articles to enlighten the public upon what essentially is "sport", and to make it clear that it is the great school of devotion to duty, abnegation, and service to the community, qualities which are essential to the balance of modern democracy.

b)---By insisting, in the accounts of sporting events, not so much upon the result achieved as upon the qualities of courage, endurance, and dexterity which the competitors have displayed.

c) and especially in giving at least as much importance to acts of sporting spirit as it does to-day to regrettable incidents.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, the committee considered the education of spectators. In addition to the press propaganda, it was proposed to print in Olympic programs and post on stadium walls statements that would make the spectators think about the "sporting spirit." Attached to the report was an example of the type of information intended:

#### ARE YOU A SPORTSMAN?

THINK:

##### As a Player

- 1.--Do you play the Game for the Game's sake?
- 2.--Do you play for your team and not for yourself?
- 3.--Do you carry out your captain's orders without question or criticism?
- 4.--Do you accept the umpire's decision absolutely?
- 5.--Do you win without swank and lose without grouching?
- 6.--Would you rather lose than do anything which you are not sure is fair?

Then you are in the way to become a sportsman.

##### As a Spectator

- 1.--Do you refuse to cheer good play by your opponents?
- 2.--Do you boo the umpire when he gives a decision you do not like?
- 3.--Do you want to see your side win if it does not deserve to?
- 4.--Do you quarrel with spectators for backing the other side?

Then you are no sportsman.

Try to become one.<sup>16</sup>



The whole report was published the following year in the 1926 issue of the *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*<sup>17</sup>

At this time, the I.O.C. often concerned itself with peripheral interests. In 1925, the British members, led by General Kentish, proposed a motion by which the I.O.C. would call to the attention of N.O.C.s and governments the need for playing fields in all cities, towns, and villages. Their concern was for those sporting organizations "on whose hands rest the physical and moral education of their respective populations"<sup>18</sup> who were having difficulty finding enough playing fields. The following year a letter was drafted for I.O.C. members to take to their N.O.C. and/or governments asking that attention be paid to the provision of adequate "Sport Grounds."<sup>19</sup>

Another instance of the tendency of the I.O.C. members to adopt the physical and moral development rationalization in speeches, arose at the opening of the Berlin Congress of 1930. Baillet-Latour was defending an action taken by the Executive Board which had appeared, to some members, to condone broken time payments by the Football Federation. In his address he explained:

. . . the Olympic conception of amateur sport which is as follows: amateur sport, so far as the youth of the country is concerned, aims at the physical development of the body and as regards the adult it should serve as a distraction, as well as a safeguard of his or her health. Understood in this sense, it produces a balanced and active mind in a strong and virile body; it neither takes away its devotees from their studies nor from their work; it is a pastime and not a principal occupation.<sup>20</sup>

The congress was asked to find a solution to the problem and this they did--by forbidding compensation for lost salaries.<sup>21</sup> Was it, however, the reminder of the lofty aims of Olympism in the area of physical and





mental health that convinced the congress to make that decision?

Welcoming speeches delivered at meetings were favourite (and logical) moments for I.O.C. presidents to wax eloquent about Olympism. Once more, Baillet-Latour called upon sport groups to observe the amateur rules at the meeting of the Executive Board with the I.F.s in 1933. There was a concerted effort at that time to eliminate semi-professionalism, and Baillet-Latour predicted disturbing results if the amateur rules were violated:

[The I.O.C.] understands the necessity of ensuring the scrupulous observance of the qualification rules, if the Games are to retain their moral value. If we do not succeed in checking the advance of Semi-Professionalism, the physical benefits which one gets from sport will not weigh in the balance against the moral evils which will accrue from it.<sup>22</sup>

As has been discussed previously (p. 38), it is difficult to identify the exact meaning of the word "moral" as used by Coubertin, and I.O.C. spokesmen also used it obscurely. However, the 1925 congress report on sporting education seemed to incorporate attitudes that could be subsumed under the heading of moral (or character) attributes. Therefore, the further encouragement of the I.O.C. to educate the public in the proper "sporting spirit" may be interpreted as adherence to the moral factor of Olympism. This topic was raised again at the 1933 Vienna session of the I.O.C. by the Finnish member, E. Krogius. He reviewed the 1925 statement from the Prague Congress and doubted whether any advances had been made in enlightening the public and press. To remedy the situation, he proposed that the "Are You a Sportsman?" statement produced at Prague be printed in each Olympic program and that the following text be posted at the Olympic competition sites:



- 1) The task of the referee or umpire calls for his full attention; do not distract it by shouting unnecessary remarks or giving him advice.
- 2) Neither competitors nor spectators should show dissatisfaction with the referee.
- 3) Do not criticise the referee.
- 4) A sportsman should show his appreciation of good play.
- 5) Do not forget that the visiting team or teams are our guests.
- 6) Do not forget the custom of hospitality.<sup>23</sup>

The I.O.C. rallied behind Krogus's appeal, unanimously agreeing:

(1) to begin studies on the topic; (2) to have the "maxims" printed in the Berlin Olympic booklet and to request N.O.C.s to circulate them to all N.S.G.B.s; and (3) to require that sporting education be added to the agenda of all subsequent I.O.C. sessions.<sup>24</sup>

Enthusiasm diminished over the next few years. While certainly sporting education was listed on the agendas, the reports appeared to be little more than "work continuing" submissions. In 1936, the comment was made that Yugoslavia had used some of Krogus's ideas.<sup>25</sup>

Not until 1954 was concern again expressed for promoting the moral aspect of sport. At the I.O.C. meeting at Athens that year, President Brundage broached the subject of the perception of the public and press about "the amateur statute and the philosophy of the Olympic Movement. We are too much occupied with technical questions and a little neglectful of the moral side of our task,"<sup>26</sup> he admonished. No concrete proposals were made, but Brundage asked the members to reflect on the problem so some action could be taken.

The pressures of modern society have affected the I.O.C. as



they have other ventures. The burgeoning number of problems and the intricate sensitivities to be handled turned the I.O.C. into an organization that had little time for sermonizing. The factors of Olympism which had been basic to the whole movement were ignored while the I.O.C. struggled with solutions to the intense amateur and political questions if the Olympic Movement were to be preserved. During the 1950's and 1960's, President Brundage still spoke glowingly of the role of sport and the Olympic Games in creating physical and moral well-being, but these pronouncements were for public consumption, not only for I.O.C. work sessions. Whether or not I.O.C. members occasionally invoked exalted ideals to promote a point of view, such detail was now being edited out of the circulated Minutes. Members presenting prepared resolutions, which were attached as appendices, still alluded to the goals of the Olympic Movement, but the I.O.C. was more often exhorted to solve problems in a contemporary businesslike manner.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 11

<sup>1</sup>International Olympic Committee, "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1919" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1919), April 5.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Antwerp, 1920, August 24.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., Rome, 1923, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., Prague, 1925, p. 13.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>9</sup>Czechoslovak Organising Committee [C.O.C.] "Report of Committee No. II upon Sporting Education," *Minutes of the Technical Olympic Congress: Prague, May 29-June 4, 1925* (Prague: Czechoslovak Olympic Committee, State Printing Office, 1925), p. 37.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>I.O.C., "Decisions Taken by the Technical Congress at Prague," *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 1 (January, 1926), 15-16.

<sup>18</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lisbon, 1926," May 7, morning.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., Monaco, 1927, April 26.

<sup>20</sup>Henri de Baillet-Latour, speech at the "Opening of the Olympic Congress," I.O.C., *Minutes of the Olympic Congress of Berlin 1930: IIIrd*





*Year of the IXth Olympiad, May 25-30* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1930), p. 13.

<sup>21</sup>I.O.C., "Resolutions of the Olympic Congress of Berlin," *Minutes of the Olympic Congress of Berlin 1930: IIIrd Year of the IXth Olympiad, May 25-30* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1930), p. 65.

<sup>22</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the I.O.C. and of the Council of Delegates of the I.F.s: Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 2.

<sup>23</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 13.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1936," p. 3.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., Athens, 1954, p. 20.



## CHAPTER 12

### ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD INTERNATIONALISM

#### Introduction

Pierre de Coubertin believed that the characteristics of pride of country and loyalty could be stimulated by international sport contests. His early motive in encouraging French athletes to compete against other nations apparently was to rebuild the self-respect of France's youth after the defeat by the Prussians. It was not long until he recognized the fraternal atmosphere that sport could generate. The ability of the athlete to appreciate the skill of a superior competitor, regardless of his nationality, seems to have caused Coubertin to see sport in a new role--that of peacemaker. However, he recognized the limits to this potential function of sport--that athletic contests could be only one route to eventual international peace. Nevertheless, he firmly believed that man's natural aggressiveness could be peacefully released in sport competition, and that the contacts with those of different backgrounds could lead to respect and reduce animosities (for further discussion see pp. 40-43). Such faith did not in any way deny pride of country, rather it enhanced it. Respect from others could not be expected without self-respect having been achieved. National loyalty was a natural outcome for both athletes and spectators. Therefore, the Olympic Games were organized on a basis of national representation with emphasis on the participant's country of citizenship. The tradition of raising the flag and playing the national anthem of the winner during



the victory ceremony was intended to recognize this national pride and loyalty and seemed harmless enough in the early years. However, Coubertin must have been aware of the opportunity for misuse of the nationalism factor in the Olympic Games because he was determined that the I.O.C. should not be composed of national delegates, and he was adamant that the right to host the Games should be given to a city, not to a country. There was never any question but that government support for the Games would be necessary, but he apparently hoped that this could be kept under control by granting the Games to a city.

Given the degree to which national identity was incorporated into the Games from the beginning, it is not surprising that this element assumed greater importance as time passed. Indeed, the early Olympic rules admitted a ranking by nations based on the number of medals won by each country's athletes.<sup>1</sup> The I.O.C. soon realized that this encouraged attitudes contrary to the peace and goodwill intent of the Games, and the 1914 Lausanne Congress abolished such ranking,<sup>2</sup> but the press replaced it with their own system and I.O.C. protestations have gone unheeded.

In 1952, at the Oslo General Assembly, Brundage described that practice as a "fanciful notion of the journalists, [which] is in direct opposition to the spirit of the I.O.C."<sup>3</sup> Five months later at Helsinki, this attitude was enunciated in the following press release:

The I.O.C. deplores the practice in the newspapers of the world, of attributing and publishing tables of points showing national placings in the Olympic Games. This is entirely contrary to the rules and spirit of the Olympic Games, which are contests between individuals with no points scored.<sup>4</sup>

A decision to print a disclaimer on this subject "in all programs and booklets" was made at the General Assembly of 1953.<sup>5</sup> When that



tactic was unsuccessful, Brundage sent out a circular letter which received comment in the press. Reporting that development to the I.O.C. in 1956, the president added his doubt that "the papers will stop publishing such classifications but it is good that the public in general had been informed that these classifications mean nothing and are not authorized by the I.O.C."<sup>6</sup>

The I.O.C. reproaches have had little effect, as the "medal count" has continued to be one of the most emphasized aspects of Olympic Games press coverage.

Throughout its long history, the I.O.C. has endeavoured to avoid political involvement and decisions, but the international character of the Games has prevented it from achieving its goal. Although in the first years the problems were relatively minor, their political cast was obvious. As the 20th century progressed through revolution and wars this aspect of Olympic organization intensified until politically associated issues took up the bulk of time at I.O.C. sessions. The I.O.C. evaded as many situations as possible and censured members who blatantly made political remarks, but it was doomed to failure in today's world. Internationalism and politics have become inextricably bound together in the Olympic milieu since World War II. An examination of the attitudes and actions of the I.O.C. toward internationalism, therefore, must include a study of the political problems facing the Olympic Games and the efforts of the I.O.C. to solve them in the best interests of sport and without a political bias.

The following material relative to the I.O.C.'s attitudes and actions to promote internationalism has been organized into sections to





facilitate clarity. Two major sections are presented. The first section reports those actions which are clearly attempts to spread an understanding of Olympism internationally--which includes the development of regional Games, the support for a World Olympic Day, and the establishment of the International Olympic Academy. The second section deals with the political problems in which the I.O.C. became embroiled. Sub-headings on this topic include denials of political interference, invitations to participate in the Games, recognition of N.O.C.s, and racially based political interference.

It is impossible to include every motion or comment reported in the I.O.C. Minutes which may have had an international implication. For instance, "international peace" can be found quoted as the reason for some individual's position on many questions, and to identify every such mention would be confusing. Therefore, the issues discussed are those with continuing emphasis, sharp conflicts, or those with far-reaching ramifications. Many of the most serious problems of a political nature were still unresolved at the 1970 time limitations of this study; others, surprisingly, received little if any airing in I.O.C. meetings. The latter circumstance may be explained by the annual character of I.O.C. General Assemblies. Many difficulties must be handled by the Executive Board in the interim between meetings. Also, in recent years the Minutes of the I.O.C. have become much more business-like, depending on committee reports and the recommendations of the Executive Board, and eliminating the comments of individual members. For the foregoing reasons, final solutions are not presented for some problems and a few others (for example, the 1968 agitations at Mexico City) are not mentioned.



## SPECIAL PROJECTS TO SPREAD OLYMPISM INTERNATIONALLY

Regional Games

The concept of Olympism, including as it does a search for international peace, must be understood in all corners of the world if the Olympic Games are to achieve their grand purpose. The I.O.C., therefore, could be expected to take direct action to promote such knowledge in areas of the world where sporting traditions were lacking. The principal tool for this task has been the proliferation of the "Games" phenomena. The earliest move to encourage international sport competition in the pattern of the Olympic Games occurred at the 1921 I.O.C. General Assembly when E. S. Brown of the Y.M.C.A. requested the patronage of the I.O.C. for "Games" being planned for South America and India. The I.O.C. appeared to be lukewarm to the proposal, but four days later Sloane (U.S.A.) insisted the topic be reconsidered and this time there was unanimous approval.<sup>7</sup> From that time forward the I.O.C. has been involved as an official champion of regional games in many areas of the world. One year later, Brown reported that the Games of the Far East were taking place, and those of Latin America would occur in Rio de Janiero in 1922 with the moral, if not financial, support of the I.O.C. At the same time, Brown suggested that European Games should be held for those countries where sport was not well advanced.<sup>8</sup> During the 1922 I.O.C. meeting, a second proposal for European Games was made which would have divided the less developed sporting nations into two groups, one centred in Poland and the other in Roumania. Both the Latin American and European projects were suspected of having political overtones. In Rio



the Brazilian government had appointed an "Executive Committee and had put \$250,000 at its disposal."<sup>9</sup> This knowledge resulted in a statement that "in these conditions they [I.O.C.] could not even discuss maintaining I.O.C. patronage."<sup>10</sup> Evidently the method of grouping the European states for competition, and the fact that the host cities would be those with the least sport organization, caused Baillet-Latour to consider the two European projects "of a political order, the first attempting to centralize in Warsaw the sporting effort of Eastern Europe from Helsinki to Athens, the second creating 'Games of the Petite Entente.'"<sup>11</sup> A long discussion ensued wherein several members questioned the wisdom of I.O.C. intervention. Gautier-Vignal (Monaco) observed that the debate was of "outstanding importance because the decision taken by the I.O.C. would create a precedent."<sup>12</sup> The consensus appeared to be that the I.O.C. had not the right to prohibit such games but might discourage them by withholding its patronage. Gautier-Vignal insisted that the I.O.C. should "limit its actions to the Olympic Games."<sup>13</sup> However, the official statement on the problem, passed unanimously, made it clear that there was less fear of political manipulation in the regional games than in those of Europe:

Considering however much the Far East Games and Latin American Games answer an expressed need, it does not appear, especially in the current political and economical circumstances, desirable to encourage regional Games in Europe, the International Olympic Committee declares it can approve or recommend only such enterprises between two or three neighbouring countries which are organized in a simple fashion, exclusively for sporting preparation for the Olympic Games.<sup>14</sup>

A portentous action was taken in 1923 when several African colonies sent emissaries to the I.O.C. General Assembly to obtain its support for sport in Africa. The proposal was to organize African Games in order to



encourage African sport, to distribute to the natives annual medals as prizes, and to prepare plans to extend sport education, all in the aim of "preparing, little by little, the black population to embrace sport."<sup>15</sup> Throughout the six days of the session, the African visitors appeared to have met separately, reporting their progress periodically to the I.O.C., then taking the I.O.C. reactions back to their own group for further consultation. The final presentation outlined the creation of a committee to direct the organization of African Games which would be held every two years in various cities and would be "exclusively reserved for natives." The first competitions would be held in Algiers in 1925.<sup>16</sup> The I.O.C. accepted the proposition.<sup>17</sup> Mayer evaluated the action thus: "It appeared that the I.O.C. was searching to promote the internationalism of sport."<sup>18</sup> Mayer also said that "the 'conquest of Africa' was close to Coubertin's heart."<sup>19</sup> He quoted the words of Coubertin spoken at the opening of the 1923 General Assembly:

. . . perhaps it appears premature to dream of implanting, in a retarded continent, among populations yet deprived of elementary culture, the principle of sport contests--and singularly presumptuous to expect of this extension a strength to accelerate the march of civilisation.<sup>20</sup>

Mayer continued to explain Coubertin's feelings: "Coubertin was tormented by the African spirit: unemployed forces, individual idleness and a need for collective action."<sup>21</sup> Coubertin must have been pleased by the I.O.C. agreeing to support African sport.

Unfortunately, the African Games ran into difficulties immediately. At the 1924 I.O.C. General Assembly, Algiers reported it was unable to fulfil its undertaking and the Games were put off to 1927 in Alexandria. The responsibility felt by the I.O.C. was evidenced when Bolanaki (Egypt)





was named as commissioner-general for the African Games.<sup>22</sup> The I.O.C. also approved a plan to collect money from the athletes taking part in the concurrent Olympic Games in order to mint medals as gifts to "native youths from the youth of other parts of the world." The inscription on the medal was to be in Latin because so many different languages were spoken in Africa, and was to read: "The characteristics of the athlete must be to know himself, to govern himself, to conquer himself."<sup>23</sup>

Later in the session, Baillet-Latour reported on the tour he had made of the Far East and South and Central America. He had held many meetings and did much "to establish a solid base not only for Olympism but also for the International Federations."<sup>24</sup> Mayer called attention to the fact that "sport concepts were not the same [in those countries] as in Europe. Even today there are conflicts and misunderstandings--unhappily more of a political order."<sup>25</sup>

Baillet-Latour appeared to be very well satisfied with the development of sport and regional games in the areas he visited. Rules and fundamental principles were being drafted in all areas to provide solid and durable bases for the organizations. Coubertin mentioned that "the South American continent will certainly become one of the citadels of Olympism."<sup>26</sup> The I.O.C. then decided to name I.O.C. members to play a liaison role for the areas where regional games were maturing. One major problem in Africa and South America was that of size, and spreading sport knowledge to the "hinterland." It was suggested that the Football Federation should draw up a sort of "grammar book of football for native use."<sup>27</sup> Other activities recommended were baseball, archery, running, and javelin throwing.



Again, the African Games were postponed two years to 1929 because the Alexandria stadium would not be completed on time,<sup>28</sup> but even then the games did not take place. At the 1929 I.O.C. General Assembly in Lausanne, which should have been held in Alexandria, it appeared that the main reason for the cancellation of the African Games was the lack of support from other African countries.<sup>29</sup>

During the period when Africa was trying to institute sport competitions for the first time, the Far East was moving smoothly into a stable pattern with the ninth renewal of the Far Eastern Games in 1930 at Tokyo.<sup>30</sup>

The leaders of the I.O.C. at this time seemed indefatigable in travelling the world to spread the Olympic precepts. Baillet-Latour had made an extensive trip in the early 1920's and reported on a second one to the 1933 I.O.C. General Assembly. He visited Australia, New Zealand, and several countries of south-eastern Asia. In his session-opening speech, he made two notable comments about the latter:

. . . I got valuable help from the intellectual classes who were far better versed in Olympic questions than I had expected . . . . The Federations of Sport are perfectly organised and wonderfully seconded by the European residents.

The natives, in spite of the heat of the tropics, love to indulge in violent exercise: the Olympic Idea appeals to their sense of the mystic.<sup>31</sup>

Both remarks probably reflected the rather superior attitudes of the I.O.C. directors at that period.

It was three years later before regional games again figured in the Minutes of an I.O.C. General Assembly. The Far East Athletic Association was dissolved and replaced by another organization which did not



include China. President Baillet-Latour suggested there may no longer be a good reason for holding the Far East Games, as there were now wide divergences between the athletic capabilities of the various countries. The Japanese and Chinese members committed their countries to solve the question of these games. The president observed that he "does not doubt that all the difficulties will be resolved for the best of the countries on sporting grounds and without political considerations."<sup>32</sup> A strong faith, especially in view of the fact that China had been left out of the new organization.

By this time the proliferation of regional games was widespread. The I.O.C. was usually asked for its patronage, but not always. Games now held included the Balkan Games, the Colombian Games, the Central American Games, and several others. The situation was rapidly developing where several major "Games" meets were held each year. At the same I.O.C. meeting, the suggestion was made to create a new "zone" in South America. The idea was refused, apparently on the grounds that South American sport was too heavily influenced by governments and orientated to politics.<sup>33</sup>

After World War II another type of "Games" organization appeared on the scene and this one was not welcomed by the I.O.C. It was reported that the U.S.S.R. was planning to hold some "Workers Games" which would be called "Olympic." Although the greatest concern was expressed over the unauthorized use of the word Olympic, a strong political apprehension was also evident. Brundage felt "it is a grave question and merits our attention . . . . it is an attempt at political leanings."<sup>34</sup> Polignac (France) was convinced that,

This project is part of a communist idea directed against the



idea called "bourgeois" which risks ending in conflict. We are not against receiving the workers in our world. We have proven it until now and we will continue to act thusly on the condition that those who wish to join us submit to our regulations.<sup>35</sup>

Today it might be difficult to decide who was the victor in this situation.

During the same 1946 General Assembly, Brundage, reporting on the state of affairs of various regional games, said they all were apparently planning to renew their sport meetings. He remarked that the Olympic Movement was well developed in many areas of Latin America.<sup>36</sup> Note was also made that "Games" in the Balkans, North Africa, and India were all under I.O.C. auspices and were contributing to the Olympic Movement. Arrangements were made to organize African Games again.<sup>37</sup>

In 1947, the I.O.C. heard that not much interest had been shown in the African Games except for Egypt and South Africa. The Executive Board was asked to study the suggestion of replacing them with Mediterranean Games.<sup>38</sup> When the subject was mentioned in 1948, the Executive Board members were not very enthusiastic but Polignac believed the Mediterranean Games would be "an excellent means of interesting the world in Olympism. This was Coubertin's idea."<sup>39</sup> Taher Pacha (Egypt) reminded the I.O.C. that preparations were well advanced to hold the Games in 1951 and that all countries touching the Mediterranean would be invited. It was decided to ask the I.F.s if these games should be instituted.<sup>40</sup> The report of that meeting was sent to the I.O.C. members before the General Assembly of 1949 and was later accepted without discussion. The I.F. reactions must have been either positive or ignored, because the I.O.C. adopted a report by Pacha that the





Mediterranean Games would take place in 1951.<sup>41</sup>

A sub-committee with Brundage as chairman was named in 1951 to study the regulations of regional games. The submission of that group in 1952 contained few differences from I.O.C. rules with three exceptions. First, Olympic winners in individual contests would not be allowed to take part, in the interests of encouraging other athletes. Second, the Olympic ceremonies were not to be copied, "particularly the flame, the trumpets, the hymn and the pigeons." Third, the words "Olympic" and "Olympiad" and the Olympic rings were not to be used.<sup>42</sup> The report was sent back to the sub-committee for reconsideration of several points.<sup>43</sup> At the second 1952 session, during the Helsinki Games, the proposal came back relatively unchanged (except that Olympic victors were not prohibited from participation) and was committed to the Executive Committee for final editing.<sup>44</sup>

At this time the attitude of Brundage to regional games was rather surprising, considering his past support for such manifestations. At the Helsinki meeting he intimated that the regional games "might create a danger" and that the I.O.C.'s only control was "the protection of the Olympic emblems." His experience at regional games had shown him that,

. . . we had lost all authority and this must be avoided in the future. . . . Our aim is the safeguarding of the Olympic Movement's interests and this can be best achieved by intruding as little as possible in the Regional Games.<sup>45</sup>

It would appear that Brundage did not hold out much hope that regional games would be held in the proper Olympic spirit and so, although rules were established in order for patronage to be granted, the connection



with the Olympic Games was not to be so close that people might believe the I.O.C. to be responsible for the regional games.<sup>45</sup>

That expression of belief on Brundage's part eased the I.O.C.'s position on the next problem involving the Mediterranean Games which were held immediately following the General Assembly of 1955 in Barcelona. Israel complained to the I.O.C. that it had not been invited to participate. The answer given by the Spanish Olympic Committee was to the effect that as Israel had not competed in the first Mediterranean Games it was not eligible for the Barcelona meet. The I.O.C. decided not to intervene in the argument.<sup>46</sup>

By 1963 politics were seriously interfering with the status of the regional games. The Games of the New Emerging Forces (G.A.N.E.F.O.), held in Jakarta in 1963, were the cause of much international sport disturbance. Because the G.A.N.E.F.O. were instituted by the president of the Indonesian Republic and the invitations were sent through diplomatic channels, the I.F.s were not in control of the technical arrangements, and the games were labelled "entirely political."<sup>47</sup> The I.O.C. suspended the Indonesian Olympic Committee, and some athletes who had participated from other countries were forbidden entry to the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games.

Racial problems were added to political ones in the regional games in 1965. South Africa was excluded from the new African Games at Brazzaville and protested to the I.O.C. President Brundage explained that South Africa was not eligible since it had not competed at the Tokyo Olympics because it had not "respected the Olympic Rules."<sup>48</sup> The Central American Games planned for Puerto Rica were in doubt because of



the host country's refusal to grant visas to Cuban athletes. The authorities claimed to be fearful of disorders caused by Cuban refugees if the Cuban team attended. The I.O.C. decided that if the visas were not forthcoming it would refuse its patronage.<sup>49</sup>

Israel was again not invited to the Mediterranean Games of 1967 to be held in Tunis, so, after some discussion, the 1967 I.O.C. General Assembly agreed not to grant its patronage and required that the name be changed to the "Tunis Mediterranean Games." Also, "it was decided that the I.O.C. should be less liberal in granting its patronage and would, in future, only grant it to long-standing, real Regional Games . . . ."<sup>50</sup>

The regional games appear to have achieved their original purpose of spreading interest in sport across the world, and of acting as a competitive preparation for Olympic athletes. The eventual intrusion of politics into these games was a reflection of conditions in many fields of endeavour involving international contacts. Doubtless, part of the cause was the financial dependence of sport organizations in poor countries on their governments.

#### World Olympic Day

Sporadically over the years, the I.O.C. has worried about its public image and the effect of Olympic "propaganda," now usually called "public relations." The I.O.C. had always been concerned to cast its message of Olympism world-wide, but it seemed to concentrate only on groups with existing sport involvement. In 1947 (very late in I.O.C. history), J. Gruss, a new member for Czechoslovakia, submitted a project



for a "World Olympic Day." He proposed that "each country would organize according to its ideas and conceptions . . . [and that] this day would be active advertising in favour of Olympism."<sup>51</sup> The chancellor was asked to prepare a program for such celebrations and report at the next General Assembly.<sup>52</sup>

At St. Moritz in 1948, the I.O.C. showed it was amenable to a World Olympic Day by accepting the principle of the idea, and naming a committee to make further studies. Gruss added that the cooperation "of all the schools of the world must be obtained to hold the celebrations in order to educate the youth of the world in the Olympic Idea."<sup>53</sup> Two days later the committee supported the concept of a World Olympic Day, particularly aimed at the youth of all countries, and recommended that it should be a yearly occurrence, held on June 24, the anniversary of the founding of the Olympic Games. Each N.O.C. was charged with making the arrangements for its own country. When a member proposed that this day not be obligatory, the I.O.C. agreed.<sup>54</sup>

Some countries instituted Olympic Day festivities immediately and the chancellor reported on them to the I.O.C. General Assembly in London six months later.<sup>55</sup> The following year (1949), President Edström encouraged N.O.C.s to make plans for that year.<sup>56</sup> The I.O.C. chancellor evidently attempted to find out whether the N.O.C.s were presenting Olympic Days in their countries, but he received only nine responses from the 59 N.O.C.s. All those who answered were actively supporting Olympic Days. Massard (France) proposed that a specific date be set and suggested June 17-18. The I.O.C. decided to recommend that N.O.C.s should prepare Olympic Days, but left each free as to the choice of date.<sup>57</sup>





Although the I.O.C. took little further action in I.O.C. General Assemblies to encourage World Olympic Days, at one period of time the *Olympic Rules and Regulations* included a statement encouraging such manifestations in a section entitled "General Information." The declaration invited N.O.C.s to,

. . . celebrate the revival of the Olympic Games each year during the month of June . . . . Special competitions in the various sports on the Olympic Program should be held and speeches on the Olympic Movement and its philosophy should be made in schools and clubs.<sup>58</sup>

The establishment of events such as Olympic Days in each country would seem to be an important tool for the dissemination of Olympism which could forge a common bond between people of different nationalities. The I.O.C. has not appeared to feel responsible for insisting that such affairs take place.

#### International Olympic Academy

Pierre de Coubertin had always hoped that some type of Olympic institute with an educational objective could be established. He wished to ascertain that the philosophical and historic aspect of the Olympic Games would not disappear in the ever-increasing emphasis on technical training of the athlete.<sup>59</sup> The earliest move in this direction was the founding of an International Olympic Institute at Berlin in 1938 by the German government and under the management of Carl Diem, who had also undertaken the publishing of an *Olympic Review* for the I.O.C.<sup>60</sup> Diem was also interested in setting up a centre of Olympic research in Olympia, Greece,<sup>61</sup> but nothing concrete was done about it until after World War II. In 1946, the Minutes of the General Assembly reported



that the Olympic Institute was moved to Lausanne<sup>62</sup> but it never seemed to have achieved much prominence and it had no role in the eventual development of the International Olympic Academy (hereinafter called the Academy).

When Jean Ketseas (Greece) proposed the creation of an Olympic institute to the General Assembly of the I.O.C. in 1947, Brundage supported the idea and Ketseas was requested to present more information at the London session.<sup>63</sup> There are no data in the Minutes on the contents of the report Ketseas submitted to the London meeting, but the Executive Board was directed to study the topic and consult with Diem, "an expert on the matter."<sup>64</sup>

Unanimous acceptance of the Hellenic Olympic Committee's proposal to establish an Olympic institute in Greece was obtained at the I.O.C.'s 1949 General Assembly. The Hellenic Olympic Committee was charged with all arrangements. Ketseas promised that Greece would do everything possible to see that the institution would "give beneficial results to sport and the Olympic Ideal."<sup>65</sup>

An immediate attempt to convene the first session of the institute failed when only four of the 80 N.O.C.s answered the invitation and those were refusals.<sup>66</sup> No action was taken until another suggestion of the Hellenic Olympic Committee to found an academy was made in 1955. An I.O.C. committee, which included the two Greek members, was to study the question.<sup>67</sup> Again, the subject appears to have been ignored as there was no further information in the Minutes until after the Academy had been opened.

Possibly an announcement in 1957 by German sport organizations



motivated interest in the Academy. Willi Daume (Germany) informed the I.O.C. General Assembly that a "Carl Diem Fund" had been raised in Germany to finance the completion of the excavations of the ancient Olympic stadium in Olympia as a birthday present for Diem.<sup>68</sup> The formal presentation of the excavations to the Greek government, the 1961 General Assembly of the I.O.C., and the initial convocation of the Academy all took place simultaneously.<sup>69</sup>

Nowhere do the Minutes of the I.O.C. describe the organization and function of the Academy, notwithstanding its I.O.C. patronage. The Hellenic Olympic Committee is responsible for all its functions and appears to receive little, if any, financial support from the I.O.C. Each summer a two-week session is held at the Academy "campus" at Olympia, across the road from the ancient stadium. Students, teachers, and athletes, from any country with an N.O.C. recognized by the I.O.C., gather to listen to lectures and discuss topics of Olympic history and practice. The speakers are physical education professors and Olympic functionaries from many countries, invited because of their areas of expertise.<sup>70</sup> The Academy handbook describes its "responsibility":

The most important task of the International Olympic Academy is to be the guardian of the Olympic Spirit and to spread it to the world of Sport--to explain the rules of the Games and the statutes of the International Olympic Committee--to study problems that are related with competitive sport and Olympic Games.<sup>71</sup>

The Academy's greatest worth lies in the opportunity it provides visitors of living for two weeks in close contact with those of similar interests, from so many different backgrounds. The freedom for discussions in depth of Olympic issues affords a most enlightening experience. Unfortunately, even this most friendly milieu has not managed to



eliminate completely all political tensions among the approximately 150 participants from over 30 countries.<sup>72</sup>

## POLITICAL ISSUES

### Denials of Political Interference

A recurring theme of I.O.C. public and private statements is that the Olympic Movement must hold itself apart from political involvement. Even in modern circumstances, the I.O.C. contends that sport and politics have no relationship and sport must make all possible efforts to resist political manipulations. To this end, the I.O.C. has found it necessary to make pronouncements explaining its position in controversial issues which have had a political colouration. Such declarations have occurred in the confines of the I.O.C. as reminders to the members, as well as in press releases for public consumption. An example of the former occurred in 1923 when the I.O.C. was faced with a request to allow two "groups" of Russians to participate in the Olympic Games: Russian refugees, and Russian athletes who had remained in their country. However, as the U.S.S.R. had not asked for I.O.C. recognition, both groups were ineligible for the Olympic Games. During the discussion, Edström (Sweden) and Montu (Italy) insisted that "the I.O.C. must avoid all interference in the political sphere."<sup>73</sup>

The first major political controversy in which the I.O.C. became embroiled concerned the use of the Berlin Olympic Games of 1936 for Nazi political propaganda. Many N.O.C.s were under pressure from citizen groups not to send teams to Germany. In the U.S.A. and Great Britain opinions were vociferously expressed. The I.O.C. was called upon to





remove the Games from Germany,<sup>74</sup> but it demanded promises from Germany that the Games would be held according to the Olympic rules and spirit.<sup>75</sup> On receiving the desired guarantees, the I.O.C. declared that "the political side of the affair is not under its jurisdiction but that it has a duty to see that sport remains outside of all political questions . . . ."<sup>76</sup>

During the post-war years of the 1940's and 1950's there were few serious incidents requiring refutation of political involvement but the I.O.C. Minutes were punctuated with promptings to the members that sport must remain free from political influence. The major crisis of the period materialized at the 1956 Olympic Games in Melbourne and resulted in a series of proclamations that depict the official I.O.C. position relative to politics and the Olympic Movement. Several nations withdrew their teams from the Games as a demonstration against recent political events. Holland, Spain, and Switzerland protested the actions of the U.S.S.R. in putting down the Hungarian revolt; Lebanon and Iraq protested the British and French operation in the Suez; and China (Peking) criticized the entry of China (Formosa) in the Olympic Games.<sup>77</sup> In addition, numerous organizations had pressed the I.O.C. to exclude from the Games all nations not at peace, including the U.S.S.R, Great Britain, France, and Israel.<sup>78</sup> When the withdrawals occurred, Brundage released the following statement:

Every civilized person recoils in horror at the savage slaughter in Hungary, but that is no reason for destroying the nucleus of international co-operation and good will we have in the Olympic Movement. The Olympic Games are contests between individuals and not between nations.

We hope that those who have withdrawn from the Melbourne Games



will reconsider. In an imperfect world, if participation in sport is to be stopped every time politicians violate the laws of humanity, there will be few international contests. Is it not better to try to expand the sportsmanship of the athletic field into other areas?<sup>79</sup>

The Executive Board, while discussing all these various manifestations of nationalism, had appraised the actions as "politically inspired and not in conformity with the spirit of the Olympic Movement."<sup>80</sup>

After long deliberations on these problems, the I.O.C. decided that "all these withdrawals and protests were of a political nature and, therefore, out of order."<sup>81</sup> The I.O.C. then unanimously adopted a resolution which stated that those nations had,

. . . withdrawn from the Games for reasons other than sport.

The International Olympic Committee, an organization concerned solely with sport, expresses its sorrow and regret at these withdrawals, considering that they are not in keeping with the Olympic ideal.<sup>82</sup>

E. von Frenckell (Finland) suggested that "the I.O.C. proclaim peace in the world during the Modern Games"<sup>83</sup> as had been declared for the ancient Olympics. The text was approved and officially released to the press:

The 52nd Congress of the International Olympic Committee at its first session in Melbourne, November 1956, points out that for almost 1200 years EKECHERIA (WORLD PEACE) was proclaimed during the Olympic Games in Ancient Greece. The promotion of this ideal is still one of our objectives, and the International Olympic Committee on behalf of the tens of millions of supporters of the Olympic Movement throughout its 89 member countries, wishes to draw world attention to this fact, and also to the friendly atmosphere of good will which prevails among athletes, officials and spectators from more than three score different nations, some of which do not even maintain diplomatic connections, who are observing the amateur sport rules of fair play here in Australia during the Games of the XVIth Olympiad.<sup>84</sup>

Not until 1967 was further emphasis on peace recorded in the



Minutes. At that General Assembly, Andrianov (U.S.S.R.) put forward a long proposal involving many philosophical and practical points, one of which was a request that the I.O.C. should more publicly reiterate its position about peace and sports. He suggested the I.O.C. approve a resolution,

. . . expressing the firm I.O.C. position concerning [the] peace and war problem, taking into consideration that there is no sport without peace, and that the strengthening of peace is the basic ground of progress in sports developments.<sup>85</sup>

He also wanted the I.O.C. to encourage "practical activities to promote the education of world's youth in the spirit of mutual respect, friendship, co-operation and fair sport competition."<sup>86</sup> Andrianov's proposal resulted in this resolution:

One of the main aims of the Olympic Movement is to promote friendship and mutual understanding among the youth of all continents, thereby helping to construct a better and more peaceful world. The International Olympic Committee appeals therefore to all sportsmen to play their part. It is only in a world at peace that the Olympic Movement and International and National sports can flourish and develop.<sup>87</sup>

Although such entreaties have been repeatedly proclaimed by the I.O.C., they do not appear to have achieved their objectives.

Granting of visas to Olympic participants became a delicate political problem caused by World War II and the "Cold War." A mild tempest blew up in 1960 over the refusal of the U.S.A. to grant the requested number of visas to the East Germans. One situation involved East German journalists who were not allowed into the U.S.A. The Squaw Valley Organizing Committee made a protest to the U.S. State Department, but to no avail. The I.O.C. supported the East German position, claiming that the Olympic rules stated, "the Organizing Committee must make



adequate arrangements for the presence of the press . . . at the Games."<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, in a second visa clash between the U.S. government and the East Germans, the I.O.C. concurred with the U.S. The East Germans had been refused visas for some of their officials, but Brundage explained that this denial was legitimate because the East German contingent contained 20 more officials than the Olympic rules permitted.<sup>89</sup> The result was an I.O.C. resolution supporting the freedom of the press and outlining the details of the latter difficulty.<sup>90</sup>

The visa problem was never resolved to any degree of assurance that future incidents would be avoided. At various times, countries would not allow visas to athletes of other nations both for the Olympic Games and other less prestigious, but important, international competitions. The N.A.T.O. group was particularly resistive about visas.

The city of Grenoble almost had the Olympic Winter Games of 1968 removed to another location because of France's refusal to give visas to the East Germans.<sup>91</sup> As a member of N.A.T.O., France did not recognize East Germany as an independent country. In 1964, at the Tokyo I.O.C. General Assembly, Brundage explained the impasse when the topic arose during discussions of the "two Germanys" issue. Brundage cautioned that the separation of the previously "united" German team would have repercussions for the Grenoble Winter Games because of the impossibility of the East Germans obtaining visas. When Grenoble had been granted the Games, Prime Minister Pompidou had promised that "the government would give access to all teams 'in existing conditions.'" <sup>92</sup> To the I.O.C., the last phrase meant "according to the rules of the I.O.C." (which allow no political discrimination); to the French





government, it meant a united German team as existed at the moment the hosting application was being made.<sup>93</sup> The East Germans would apparently enter France under the cloak of the West Germans as a part of a united team. "This situation is disagreeable," concluded Brundage.<sup>94</sup> The same I.O.C. General Assembly later agreed that the German team would split hereafter, but that for both 1968 Games they would use the same banner, hymn, and emblem.<sup>95</sup> As Grenoble retained the Winter Games and East German athletes attended, this solution must have satisfied N.A.T.O. so that visas were granted.

Although the I.O.C. professes a denial of political or governmental involvement in the Olympic Movement and an intent that Olympism can assist in the achievement of world peace, it appears to feed national chauvinism by the emphasis placed on the citizenship of the athletes. Indeed, entry into the Olympic Games can be attained only by national representation. Despite Fundamental Principle 8 of the *Olympic Rules and Regulations*, which states "The Games are contests between individuals and not between countries or areas,"<sup>96</sup> no athlete may compete unless he is entered under the colours of his country. During the victory ceremony, the champion's national flag is raised on the central flagpole and his national anthem is played. The I.O.C. has withstood severe criticism for this ceremonial from individuals, in private and in the press, urging the I.O.C. to abolish the tradition. Actually, motions to terminate the nationalistic parts of the ceremony have been placed before the I.O.C. General Assembly several times. There appeared to be little realization by the I.O.C., until after World War II, that the victory rites might be accentuating the nationalism that had been a



growing concern for some years. Evidently the elimination of flags and anthems in the victory ceremony was a project favoured by Brundage, for he suggested it more than once--the first time in 1953, his initial year as I.O.C. president. At that I.O.C. General Assembly the vote was negative, but the I.O.C. accepted Count J. de Beaumont's (France) compromise that the anthems should be shortened.<sup>97</sup> In 1955, Mayer (Switzerland) proposed replacing the anthems with a trumpet fanfare but withdrew his motion because neither the I.F.s nor the N.O.C.s were in favour.<sup>98</sup> Some N.O.C.s apparently supported the idea, however, as a similar proposal was forthcoming at a special meeting of the I.O.C. Executive Board with both N.O.C.s and I.F.s in 1957. J. L. Homan of the Dutch Olympic Committee expressed "his regret at the excess of nationalism at the Olympic Games."<sup>99</sup> He went beyond the flags and anthems and included the "march past" of the athletes, in the following proposition:

- a) that the hoisting of the flags and the playing of the victor's National Anthem at the official ceremonies be discontinued.
- b) that the athletes of all nations should parade according to their sport and not by nations.
- c) that the athletes of all nations should parade in a common uniform.<sup>100</sup>

Brundage commented that the submission would be put on the agenda for the I.O.C. session three months later, but the content must have been altered as the Minutes reported that "the proposal of replacing the abridged version of the national hymns by a fanfare of trumpets is . . . rejected."<sup>101</sup>

The tenacity of President Brundage on the question of national anthems was becoming obvious by 1961 when he again asked the I.O.C. if



a fanfare of trumpets could not replace the anthems. The I.O.C. members retained the status quo by a large majority.<sup>102</sup>

A significant change in attitude occurred in 1963 at the I.F. level when those groups supported the elimination of national anthems by 31 to 1 at their meeting with the I.O.C. Executive Board.<sup>103</sup> The news appeared to have a mellowing effect on the I.O.C. because this time the vote was tied. However, as a two thirds majority was required, the motion was lost again.<sup>104</sup>

Obviously never one to give up easily, President Brundage attacked the anthem question anew in 1965, but this time his approach was much broader. He proposed:

At the time of the march-in at the opening and closing ceremonies, the teams will be preceded by the banner of their N.O.C. instead of their national flag (all banners having been approved by the I.O.C.). The N.O.C. banners can carry the national colours but exclude the country's flag.

During the medal award ceremonies the banners of the N.O.C.s will be used in place of national flags and a fanfare or sound of trumpets will replace the national hymn.

This could reduce the propensity toward excessive chauvinism, greatly criticized by our adversaries, without eliminating the honour reflected on the nation.<sup>105</sup>

The president was firmly opposed by several members who reiterated the classic argument that might well have echoed Coubertin's beliefs:

" . . . love of country is a human sentiment, beautiful and easy to understand."<sup>106</sup> On the other hand, Hodler (Switzerland) contended that "many of the I.F.s, especially skiing, have had excellent experiences [in world championships] in suppressing flags and hymns and replacing them with banners of the respective federations and fanfares of trumpets."<sup>107</sup> The I.O.C. decision, by a large majority vote, was to



retain the ceremonials as they existed.<sup>108</sup>

Another attempt to abolish the use of flags and anthems, this time just in the medal ceremony, was made in 1968 at the Mexico City I.O.C. General Assembly. The initiator of the motion was the president of the Academy, Prince George of Hanover (Germany), who justified his proposal based on several opinions (see Appendix E): (1) emphasis on nation is contrary to the purpose of the Olympic Games to unite the youth of the world; (2) the individual athlete should be honoured and not have attention distracted to the flag; (3) there are so many events that there is a superfluity of award presentations. He continued to reveal politically orientated Olympic behaviours which indicated:

. . . abuse of the Olympic Movement towards national and political ends and false national ambition.

The International Olympic Committee should, therefore, make it its objective to prevent the Olympic Games from developing more and more into statistics of national evaluation [wherein] the athletes merely fulfil the role of collecting points for their country.<sup>109</sup>

Prince George must have presented his case eloquently for he almost convinced the I.O.C. Several I.O.C. members spoke in favour of the motion, maintaining that "the hoisting of national flags in the Olympic Village is enough emphasis on nationalistic feelings."<sup>110</sup> Although there was no report of negative expressions, the vote (34 to 22) failed because of the required two thirds majority.<sup>111</sup>

Whether or not the flying of flags and playing of national anthems symbolizes the highly nationalistic attitudes now rampant in the Olympic Games, concerted efforts to eliminate such manifestations from the Olympic ceremonies have repeatedly failed.





## Invitations to the Olympic Games

The topic of which countries are to be invited as participants in the Olympic Games is one which has caused only occasional disturbances and yet it is indicative of the delicacy of many I.O.C. problems. For many years the *Olympic Rules and Regulations* have provided definite instructions to the Games organizing committees:

The invitations to take part in the Games must be sent out by the Organizing Committee on the instructions of the International Olympic Committee. They are addressed to the recognized National Olympic Committee of each country . . . .

Invitations shall be sent by mail and not through diplomatic channels.<sup>112</sup>

However, when political feelings are high, even I.O.C. recognition is no guarantee of an invitation. After World War I the question had to be faced as to which nations would be invited to the 1920 Games in Antwerp. It was decided to invite only those nations represented on the I.O.C.<sup>113</sup> Of course, no one had any information about the members from the "Central Powers" and so those countries were not listed.<sup>114</sup> Coubertin explained the situation:

Few months had passed since the last German soldier had left Belgian soil and the last gun had been fired. Good sense indicated that German athletes could not appear in an Olympic stadium before 1924. However, to make a solemn proclamation of ostracism, the day after the conflict which had bloodied Europe, would create a breach in the Olympic constitution which had been solid until now; it could set a dangerous precedent. The solution was very simple. It was, at each Olympiad, the organizing committee who, according to the formula employed since 1896, transmitted the invitations. It [Antwerp] was, therefore, in control of this distribution, otherwise the fundamental principle of universality would have received a direct blow. The I.O.C., then, had no decision to make. Nevertheless, . . . it enumerated the countries which would be invited, under the pretext that the others were not represented on the I.O.C.<sup>115</sup>

Thus, potentially inflammable confrontations on the Olympic field were



avoided. Before the 1924 Games, all the nations that had been excluded in 1920 were reinstated.

In the interim between the two World Wars, invitations to attend the Olympic Games posed no difficulties. The only disturbances to crop up were related to the recognition of N.O.C.s of countries which were not self-governing, and the I.O.C. evaded most decisions by insisting it could not legislate on such political issues, consigning the responsibility to the controlling nation.<sup>116</sup>

A repeat of the post-war prejudice of 1919 prevailed in 1946. London had been awarded the Games and decisions had to be made about the invitations. The ploy used after World War I would not work this time so another logical excuse was devised. The I.O.C. decision was that only countries with N.O.C.s could compete and that occupied countries did not fit this category as they had no governments and no legal organizations.<sup>117</sup>

The only other times that countries have not been invited to participate in the Olympic Games (other than those who had no recognized N.O.C.) have been when the I.O.C. has rescinded its recognition because of failure of the N.O.C. to conform to Olympic rules. In most cases the reason for the annulment has had a political base, and the ban has been lifted after a short time. The major exception was the case of South Africa (for further discussion see pp. 292-302).

#### Recognition of N.O.C.s

No country may participate in the Olympic Games unless its N.O.C. is recognized by the I.O.C. The basis of acceptance, according



to the I.O.C. rules, is "dependent on the country or area having had a stable government for a reasonable period."<sup>118</sup> The fact that recognition of N.O.C.s has caused more tumult than any other topic since World War II suggests the I.O.C. rule is difficult to interpret. However, further criteria for acceptance are that the N.O.C.'s rules, regulations, and structure conform to I.O.C. standards. In the early years of the I.O.C. there appeared to be little hindrance to obtaining recognition. The only hesitations involved those areas which felt a unique identity but were not self-governing, such as Morocco and the Phillipines. When the governing nations agreed that these countries could display their own flags and emblems, potential conflicts disappeared.<sup>119</sup>

The acceptance of Ireland was a situation which took some time to resolve. In 1920, Ireland requested participation under the British flag, but as a separate group. R. S. Courcy-Laffan (Great Britain) proposed delaying the decision "until the time when the Ireland question will be politically solved."<sup>120</sup> The Irish Olympic Committee tried again the following year, but Laffan wanted the I.O.C. to wait until the situation of two Irish parliaments had settled down.<sup>121</sup> It would appear that recognition was given in 1922 when J. J. Keane (Ireland) was elected to I.O.C. membership. This did not bring an end to Irish troubles in the Olympic Games. There was conflict at times between some of their internal sports organizations.<sup>122</sup> Years later the question of the name of the N.O.C. caused some dissension. The Irish wished to be called "Ireland" but, in 1951, the I.O.C. decided to designate them the "Republic of Ireland."<sup>123</sup> This was not the last time that the name of a country was to create tensions in the Olympic Movement.



The status of Palestine and Israel exposed divergent opinions among the I.O.C. members in 1948 when Israel attempted to enter two female athletes in the London Games. Several members considered the dilemma to be politically based so they counselled that the I.O.C. should not allow itself to be involved. Fearnly (Norway) declared that if the I.O.C. observed its rules no action was needed because "Palestine is no longer a state and Israel has no Olympic Committee."<sup>124</sup> Pacha (Egypt) suggested that the treatment would be different depending upon which group had asked for entry to the Games:

If it was Palestine which has the great majority of the population, he would advise an affirmative answer. If it was Israel his advice is negative. This country, geographically speaking as we know it, is in no condition to enter the games.<sup>125</sup>

A decision was deferred to the next year. In 1950, Israel was again put off one year. Complications arose in 1951 when two committees requested recognition. They were told to get together and present a joint proposal which would guarantee that "all athletes of the country without distinctions of race, religion or opinion would be admitted into the organization."<sup>126</sup> At the Oslo General Assembly in 1952, Israel must have fulfilled the imposed conditions, as Edström informed the members that the Executive Board had recognized Israel "according to the decisions adopted at the Vienna Session."<sup>127</sup>

These difficulties were relatively minor compared to the upsets caused by the requests for recognition of two Germanys, two Chinas, and two Koreas. The German question developed first. German athletes were not allowed to compete in the Olympics of 1948 because the area was occupied by the Allied Nations and consequently no N.O.C. could legally





exist. By 1950, however, West Germany wished to be accepted back into the Olympic family.

The first serious discussion of the re-entry of Germany into Olympic circles came at the 1950 I.O.C. General Assembly when Lord Burgley read a supportive letter from General Robertson, the British High Commissioner in West Germany. Robertson contended that an invitation to the 1952 Helsinki Games would be an effective means of assuring German youth that their isolation was ended and that they would be accepted into the community of nations desiring peace. The I.O.C. cautiously decided to recognize the N.O.C. of "this newly constituted state,"<sup>128</sup> with the proviso that discussions would be held between the Executive Board and the West German N.O.C. before athletes would be accepted into the Olympic Games.<sup>129</sup> Full recognition of West Germany was recommended by the Executive Board and accepted.

The next question to be resolved was that of the status of the Germans who had been I.O.C. members before World War II. It appeared they were in West Germany and with the recognition of that N.O.C. they could be expected to resume their seats. Some members felt that a new N.O.C. had been accepted and therefore new individuals should be elected. Edström insisted that the gentlemen in question "had never ceased to be members."<sup>131</sup> Several members from northern Europe believed that the two Germans had been part of the "old régime" and for that reason could not represent the spirit of the new Germany. Edström refused to put the issue to a vote, stating that one member was resigning and the other, K. Ritter von Halt, was then, and would continue to remain, an I.O.C. member.<sup>132</sup>



The preceding discussion introduced the question of East Germany, and the chancellor read a request from that area for I.O.C. recognition. The letter mentioned that the East German organization was contacting its West German counterparts to see if a single committee were possible. Thus began many years of I.O.C. involvement with the two Germanys problem. The immediate difficulty seemed to revolve around the possibility of a single N.O.C. and a single team of athletes to represent the two Germanys. Certain members felt that the I.O.C. should delay any decision until the results of negotiations between the two German groups were known. Others insisted that East Germany be treated in the same fashion as West Germany and be recognized provisionally at the current meeting, and permanently as soon as the Executive Board had decided that the East German N.O.C.'s statutes were acceptable.<sup>133</sup> A comment by R. Seeldrayers (Belgium) indicated the feelings that some members held. He said that if each N.O.C. were to send a team to the Olympic Games it would mean two teams would be from the same country and have the advantage of a greater number of competitors than other nations were permitted.<sup>134</sup> The discussion terminated when Edström announced that representatives of East Germany were in the anteroom and that the Executive Board would meet with them immediately. The I.O.C. gave full powers of negotiation to the Executive Board, including the right to annul the decision regarding West Germany if it seemed expedient to do so.<sup>135</sup> Later, Edström informed the I.O.C. that a meeting had been arranged for May, 1951, at Lausanne with the two German N.O.C.s and the Executive Board.<sup>136</sup>

At the Oslo General Assembly in February, 1952, the president



reported a breakdown in negotiations. The meeting planned by the Executive Board with the German N.O.C.s had occurred and resulted in bi-lateral meetings between the two N.O.C.s concerned in order to decide a course of action. Evidently no accord had been reached before the closing date for entries to the Winter Games in Oslo. Therefore, Edström had invited representatives of both N.O.C.s to meet with him in Copenhagen, but only the West Germans turned up at the appointed time, although it was ascertained that the East Germans were, indeed, in the city.<sup>137</sup> As a result of this stalemate, the Executive Board, applying the powers given to it in Vienna the previous year, made the following provision for German participation in the Olympic Games:

No athlete may take part in the Olympic Games unless he is certified by a national federation affiliated to an international federation and by a National Olympic Committee both recognized by the I.O.C. In Western Germany, the National Olympic Committee is recognized by the I.O.C. and also the national sport federations are recognized by their respective international federations. Since this is not the case in East Germany and since there can only be one Olympic Committee in each nation, the only way East German athletes can participate in the 1952 Olympic Games is by having their entries certified by the recognized German federations and the recognized German Olympic Committee. It is therefore necessary to have a special commission formed of West and East German representatives to organize a single German team for the Helsinki Games. In this commission there shall be 3 representatives from both East and West Germany under the chairmanship of Dr. Karl von Halt, as a Member of the I.O.C. The German team shall be selected at a special tryout held in the Olympic Stadium in Berlin and the best men shall be chosen regardless of whether they live in East or West Germany.

The German team shall march behind a mutually acceptable German flag. All technical details are to be settled by the special commission which will organize the assembling, transportation, the housing and the equipping of the team. Costs shall be divided between East and West Germany according to the ratio of the contestants finally chosen.<sup>138</sup>

However, this arrangement was never carried out. Five months later, at



the Helsinki General Assembly, Ritter von Halt reported that all efforts of the German N.O.C. to include East Germans on the Olympic team had failed. The invitations sent to the East Germans to attend team trials had been refused, even though they were offered:

. . . their own management, umpires, uniforms, that they may send and lodge their people separately, in short, anything that could confirm them in their opinion that they are an independent National Olympic Committee.<sup>139</sup>

The East Germans responded by stating they did not wish to be taken "'in tow by the West German sport misery' and refused to go to the start at the Olympic Games together with West German sportsmen."<sup>140</sup> Several members contributed opinions including Lord Killanin (Ireland) who expressed his regret that,

. . . our debates have been mixed up with politics for the last two days, by doing so, we reflect discredit on our principles and regulations . . . . The internal conflicts of countries do not concern us. Germany represents one country only and it is inadmissible for us to recognize two German National Committees.<sup>141</sup>

Certainly, attitudes of I.O.C. members exhibited a great variety of positions. Some members were concerned about the role of the I.F.s, and it was established that the I.F.s, to date, were awaiting I.O.C. leadership, but might not refrain from independent action if the I.O.C. did not make an early decision. There was much support for immediate recognition of the East German N.O.C. for various reasons. A. Porritt (New Zealand) delineated three important points:<sup>142</sup>

1. The rules did not forbid the recognition of two N.O.C.s in one country.
2. "The I.O.C. must refrain from all political inferences."<sup>143</sup>
3. The I.O.C. could make a temporary decision accepting the





Olympic Committee of East Germany provisionally, because it did effectively represent the sporting youth belonging to that part of Germany.

Brundage agreed, but suggested the I.O.C. not be too hasty, recalling that "the directive powers of the East are irresponsible people, when one takes into account the endless unsuccessful negotiations the I.O.C. entered with them in the past."<sup>144</sup>

Enlightening comments were made the following year at the General Assembly in Mexico City when a few members insisted that the problem must be solved very soon. Twice Brundage reminded the members of the offensive behaviour of the East Germans when they failed to appear at the Copenhagen meeting, and Ritter von Halt wanted "the Directive Powers of East Germany . . . [to] cease their continuous attacks on the I.O.C. and its President."<sup>145</sup>

Evidently the East Germans did not change their behaviour because, at Athens in 1954, Brundage, when reporting to the General Assembly on unsuccessful attempts to meet with the East Germans, added: "To the contrary, our efforts have resulted in a torrent of insults in the East German press against the I.O.C."<sup>146</sup> Andrianov (U.S.S.R.), a strong supporter of East German acceptance, emphasized that the president of the East German N.O.C. had stopped the flow of insults and promised that such articles would no longer be published.<sup>147</sup> At this juncture in the situation, Ritter von Halt first indicated his opposition to recognizing East Germany. He believed that the East German N.O.C. was an example of one which was not independent and, therefore, was unacceptable. He also made reference to a "brochure," circulated



by the East Germans, that contained derogative information about himself, which he labelled "a series of lies."<sup>148</sup> As a result, he said it was impossible for him to recognize East Germany.<sup>149</sup> When a vote was taken, the East German N.O.C. was rejected by 31 to 14.<sup>150</sup>

The topic of the two Germanys entered a second and more complicated phase in 1955. The I.O.C. General Assembly at Paris decided, provisionally, to recognize East Germany. However, a clause made it clear that this action would be withdrawn if a united team of East and West Germans was not formed for the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games.<sup>151</sup> Although the task of reaching an agreement on a joint German team appeared monumental, it was achieved. At the Cortina d'Ampezzo General Assembly in 1956, Ritter von Halt explained the arrangements:

Both parties will have the same flag, the same emblem and wear the same uniform. All German athletes will be boarded under the same roof. The chef de mission will be selected from the team holding the majority of athletes. The best athletes will be selected from both sides. In case of victory the hymn of the winner will be played. In case of victory by a mixed team, no hymn will be played. The latter decision is not very satisfactory but no better solution could be found . . . . Both contracting parties must sign their commitments. In our Olympic relationships all political interference has been kept out.<sup>152</sup>

Brundage was very pleased, and crowed: " . . . we have obtained in the field of sport what politicians have failed to achieve so far."<sup>153</sup>

However, the president was not so happy about newspaper articles in the East German press which exhorted the athletes and sport directors "not to lose sight of the political question during their sport exploits."<sup>154</sup>

Brundage had copies of the offensive material sent to the East German N.O.C. demanding an explanation. He planned to meet with the East Germans at which time "they will be reminded once more of our Olympic



principles."<sup>155</sup>

With the exception of the need for delicate interactions, the German problem had been resolved, and united German teams participated in the Games of 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1968. This did not mean that all members accepted the status quo, as members from Eastern European countries continued to lobby for full recognition of East Germany. In 1963, Andrianov and Romanov (U.S.S.R.) proposed a more precise name for the West German N.O.C., at that time called "National Olympic Committee of Germany." They contended that the title suggested the West German committee spoke for all of Germany and that the name should be changed "to reflect the reality of its sphere of action . . . ."<sup>156</sup> The proposal was rejected.<sup>157</sup>

In 1965 the Madrid I.O.C. General Assembly heard President Brundage affirm that the "agreement has created many difficulties"<sup>158</sup> and that the East German Olympic Committee had requested full recognition. W. Daume (Germany) contended that the difficulties had been exaggerated and that all problems could be handled.<sup>159</sup> An East German delegation was given an audience and its chief, H. Schobel, claimed that an extremely tense atmosphere existed between the athletes and officials of the two Germanys.<sup>160</sup> Finally, with the agreement of both groups, a solution was evolved which recognized each N.O.C. separately. The two Berlins would affiliate with the Olympic committee with the similar political affiliation. Also, the agreement was not to take effect until after the 1968 Games, which meant that a joint team would perform at Grenoble and Mexico City.<sup>161</sup> Although not noted in the Minutes until the 1968 I.O.C. General Assembly in Mexico City,<sup>162</sup> the 1967 *Olympic*



*Rules and Regulations* listed the names of the countries and the titles of the Olympic committees as follows:

*East Germany:* National Olympic Committee of the German Democratic Republic.

*Germany:* National Olympic Committee of Germany.<sup>163</sup>

The settlement appeared to mark the end of the issue of German representation in the Olympic Games, and the N.O.C. names have remained unchanged.

During the period of time covered by the German dilemma, the I.O.C. was faced with another inflammable problem--that of the two Chinas. As with Germany, China had been recognized by the I.O.C. long before World War II, and Chinese members had held I.O.C. seats for some years. The Chinese issue did not surface immediately after the war because the problem was caused by the Communist Revolution, not by the war. In 1949, the Chinese Olympic Committee split. Many of its members fled the country and only one of the three Chinese I.O.C. members remained in mainland China.

No effort was made until 1952 to have a mainland Chinese N.O.C. recognized by the I.O.C. At the Oslo General Assembly, Edström reported that he had met with a representative of the "All China Athletic Federation"--the official organization supervising sport in Communist China. The Chinese delegate had asked that the I.O.C. recognize China so that their athletes could participate in the Helsinki Olympic Games. Edström delineated the procedures required to attain recognition and also explained about Olympism and I.O.C. functions.<sup>164</sup> Mayer gave a detailed description of the awkward meeting and Edström's explosive behaviour<sup>165</sup> (for further discussion see p. 148). E. Frenkell (Finland) mentioned





that in an interview the Chinese minister at Helsinki had expressed surprise that no invitation had been received by the mainland Chinese to participate in the Helsinki Games,<sup>166</sup> which indicated the Chinese lack of understanding about the Olympic system.

Brundage recommended that two steps be taken to clarify the Chinese position: (1) that contact should be made with the Chinese members who were living in New York, Shanghai, and Hong Kong; and (2) that it should be determined whether or not the Chinese N.S.G.B.s were affiliated with the respective I.F.s.<sup>167</sup> Later, the Athletic Federation confirmed that there had been no news from China for some time.<sup>168</sup> Although the I.O.C. Minutes did not make reference to the presence of a Chinese representative at the General Assembly, a copy of "A speech to be delivered by Mr. Sheng Chih-pai, representative of the National Olympic Committee of China, at the meeting" was attached to the Minutes.<sup>169</sup> In the speech it was adamantly stated that,

. . . any other bodies or representatives, including the athletic bodies or representatives of the reactionary clique in Taiwan, can not be regarded as any legitimate representatives of China . . .<sup>170</sup>

The fact that the Chinese did not grasp the Olympic protocol for recognition was obvious in the concluding paragraph:

. . . the National Olympic Committee of China has decided to declare to the International Olympic Committee that we continue to participate in the Olympic organizations. The present seat of the National Olympic Committee of China is in Peking . . . . We are prepared moreover to send teams to participate in the forthcoming Olympic Games . . . .<sup>171</sup>

The two Chinas problem became a major issue beginning at the Helsinki I.O.C. General Assembly a few months later. Edström introduced the dilemma by reminding the members that,



. . . the National Olympic Committee of Nationalist China (Formosa) is the only Committee recognized by us. On the other hand, the O.C. of Democratic China (Pekin) claims the rights to be the only Committee representing the whole of China.<sup>172</sup>

The Executive Board recommended that neither Chinese group be allowed to participate in the Helsinki Games.<sup>173</sup> Edström also presented two other solutions: (1) recognize both Chinas; or (2) recognize only Formosa as it was the only committee already acknowledged by the I.O.C.<sup>174</sup> The president recommended that either both or neither of the committees be accepted.<sup>175</sup> The reason for doubt about the Formosa Olympic Committee, despite its having been recognized by the I.O.C. for some years, was that little contact had been made with it for a considerable period of time, particularly at the I.F. level.<sup>176</sup>

As delegates of both Chinese committees were in Helsinki, each was given an audience with the I.O.C. The two speeches were almost identical, each claiming their right to recognition by the I.O.C. and to send athletes to the Helsinki Games.<sup>177</sup> Nationalist China (Formosa) based its claim on previous acceptance into the I.O.C. and Olympic Games, and Communist China (Peking) on the great numbers of Chinese people for whom it spoke.<sup>178</sup> Unfortunately, the second speaker was not able to refrain from such political statements as, "the reactionary clique of the Kuomintang remnant on Taiwan."<sup>179</sup> When he also demanded that the I.O.C. expel both the N.O.C. on Formosa and the incumbent Chinese I.O.C. members, at the same time recognizing the Peking committee and inviting its athletes to participate at Helsinki,

. . . Mr. Edström points out forcefully to Mr. Sheng-Chih-pai that he is not qualified to impose conditions nor to give us advice or instructions. The I.O.C. takes all its decisions in complete independence (loud cheers from the assembly).<sup>180</sup>



Following a lengthy debate in which many members took part, a series of votes was put to the assembly. The first included two points:

1. *No Chinese teams can participate in the Helsinki Games.*  
This proposal obtains 22 votes.
2. *The two Chinese teams are authorized to participate in the Games.* This proposal is supported by 29 votes.<sup>181</sup>

The subsequent actions of the I.O.C. were so confusing that the text of the Minutes is quoted here in full:

A second round of secret balloting is asked for by the E.C., on the non-participation of the Chinese teams to the Games. This proposal stands in opposition to the one made by Mr. *F. Piétri* which runs as follows:

"The I.O.C. while reserving its ultimate decision concerning the respective situation of the All-China Athletic Federation and the Chinese National Olympic Committee at Tai-wan, which decision depends principally on a precise determination of the international status of both countries, authorizes the athletes of both organizations to participate, in agreement with the organizing committee of the Games of Helsinki, in those events of the present Games in the sports recognized by their International Federation."

*Vote:* Voting papers delivered and returned: 53.

*In favour of F. Piétri's proposal:* 33 votes.

The E.C.'s proposal obtains 20 votes.<sup>182</sup>

The second vote appeared to be simply a repeat of the first. Why the lengthy Piétri motion was necessary seems obscure. However, it now became unquestionable that participants from both Chinas were included in the Helsinki Games, as athletes from both countries were en route to Helsinki at the time, according to a comment by Brundage the following day. Brundage was concerned that the I.O.C. might be misinterpreted, so he made the following statement to clarify the situation:

In order to avoid all misunderstanding, it is necessary to specify that I.O.C. does not recognize any Chinese National Olympic Committee. On the other hand, whilst we are breaking our Rules, we do so, inspired by sympathetic feelings toward the Chinese athletes who are on their way to Helsinki. The I.O.C. authorizes them to



participate in the Games of the XVth Olympiad held at Helsinki. This decision must not be misinterpreted, it is not opening a precedent, it is but an exceptional decision.<sup>183</sup>

Brundage's statement denying I.O.C. recognition of "any Chinese National Olympic Committee" flatly contradicted Edström's stand earlier in the session that "the National Olympic Committee of Nationalist China (Formosa) is the only Committee recognized by us" (see p. 276).

To complicate the matter further, it is impossible to determine which group of Chinese athletes, if any, participated at Helsinki. Seemingly, some Chinese athletes competed in swimming and football, according to an account by Brundage in 1953 of the progress of the China problem. Unfortunately, he failed to identify clearly which China was represented.<sup>184</sup> Schaap remarked (incorrectly) that "Red" China received Olympic recognition and added, "Nationalist China immediately withdrew. (Red China's team never showed up in Helsinki)."<sup>185</sup> Monique Berlioux reported that "Peking and not Formosa sent athletes (thirty-eight men and two women) to the Helsinki Games. In spite of their doubtful position (their country had no N.O.C.) they were allowed to compete."<sup>186</sup>

Nevertheless, the two Chinas issue was no nearer solution. At the 1953 General Assembly in Mexico City, telegrams received from Shou-Yi-Tung (I.O.C. member in Peking) and from "the N.O.C. of China,"<sup>187</sup> brought the question to the table again. Brundage observed that recognition could not occur "before being fully conversant with their organizations, their Rules and Statutes."<sup>188</sup>

The candidature of the People's Republic of China (to use the proper name which was not used in I.O.C. meetings) had been supported all along by members from eastern European countries. In 1954, the





Athens General Assembly was presented with another request from the "O.C. of Democratic China." President Brundage gave a historical review of the events, emphasizing that the Chinese representatives "were diplomatic [delegates] and not sporting [delegates]," and that they "showed very little courtesy."<sup>189</sup> He continued:

We have received the rules and constitution of the N.O.C. in which it is written that the O.C. of Democratic and popular China conforms to the rules and statutes of the I.O.C. Furthermore, this constitution is very brief, 2 or 3 paragraphs only.<sup>190</sup>

In contrast, Mezo (Hungary), Stoicheff (Bulgaria), and Andrianov (U.S.-S.R.) all supported recognition, claiming that Chinese sport was directed in the Olympic spirit.<sup>191</sup> The vote that followed was close, but the "O.C. of Democratic China" was accepted 23 to 21.<sup>192</sup>

Still the difficulties were not ended. The penchant of the "Red" Chinese to make political speeches irritated Brundage intensely. During the 1955 General Assembly at Paris, the president reported an untoward incident at the meeting of the I.F.s and N.O.C.s with the Executive Board, which intruded on the harmony of the meeting. He explained the episode:

The representative of Democratic and popular China's [People's Republic of China] N.O.C. took the floor to make a declaration 99% political. I had the obligation of answering to make him understand that all political questions were banned from I.O.C. discussions. I excused him for breaking the rules, supposing that he was ignorant of them and I expressed the hope it would never happen again.<sup>193</sup>

This experience evidently made Brundage chary of statements by this member, and the next year when Shou-Yi-Tung asked to speak, "the President warns him against any eventual political remarks he might make."<sup>194</sup> The content of his remarks was certainly political: a request



that "the Olympic Committee of Nationalist China be erased from the list of National Olympic Committees."<sup>195</sup> Brundage replied that both Chinese N.O.C.s had been recognized and "the Olympic Games should be open to all the youth of the world. . . . We cannot exclude the latter [Nationalist China] any more than we can exclude the mainland China unless either infringe our Olympic rules."<sup>196</sup> Further, the president explained that if Tung wished the matter to be placed on the agenda of a future session he should follow the proper procedures, but, "it is out of the question to exclude Taiwan on political grounds."<sup>197</sup>

The Peking Olympic Committee caused additional tension in 1956 when it withdrew from the Melbourne Olympics because the Formosa Chinese had been invited.<sup>198</sup> The I.O.C. decided to send a letter to Peking expressing "resentment and displeasure at the actions of the Peking Committee in repeatedly raising political questions which have no place in International Olympic Committee discussions."<sup>199</sup> The suggestion was even made to Tung that a united team arrangement similar to the German one might be made for the Chinese teams.<sup>200</sup>

The name of the Peking committee as used in the I.O.C. Minutes was the focus of an objection by Tung at the General Assembly of 1957, when he protested that the proper title was "Democratic People's Republic of China."<sup>201</sup> He also complained that the remarks he had made at the Melbourne meeting were not included in the Minutes. Brundage replied that, in his opinion, "as the member's remarks are of a political character, they cannot appear in the Minutes."<sup>202</sup>

This was the end of mainland China's connection with the Olympics. Berlioux stated that, "in August 1958 the Olympic Committee of



the People's Democratic Republic of China withdrew from the Olympic Movement."<sup>203</sup> The Minutes contained no official communication of this event, but a member made a passing reference during a debate over the two Chinas at the I.O.C. General Assembly of 1959 at Munich. The Eastern Bloc nations appeared to be quite upset about Peking China leaving the Olympic circle. Andrianov (U.S.S.R.) proposed that Peking China be recognized as "the one and only Chinese National Olympic Committee."<sup>204</sup> In essence this position was supported by speakers from several eastern European countries. Western orientated members generally agreed that Peking should be accepted, but added that so could Taiwan if it gave up the name "China."<sup>205</sup> At this juncture an important clarification was made when Brundage explained the history of the situation:

. . . after the war the Chinese Olympic Committee had its seat in Nankin. Afterwards it moved to Taipeh (Formosa). Its change of address was ratified. At that time another Olympic Committee was formed in Peking which after a while was recognized by the International Olympic Committee.<sup>206</sup>

Although a great variety of labels had been used to describe the group directing Olympic sport on Formosa, the preceding comment suggested that the correct title was "Chinese Olympic Committee."

A series of striking comments was made during this discussion by I.O.C. members. M. Gomez (Mexico) suggested the Executive Board be given powers to enter into negotiations with Continental China because the youth of the whole world should have the right to compete in the Games.<sup>207</sup> Mohammed Taher (Egypt) countered by observing that the I.O.C. would lose independence and prestige by taking the initiative in such an approach.<sup>208</sup> F. Santos (Brazil) reminded the session that the



behaviour of the Peking delegate in 1952 had been unpleasant and that he had been a diplomat, not a sportsman.<sup>209</sup> V. Stoicheff (Bulgaria) focussed on geographical and political considerations by stating:

Formosa is not a country, it is an integral part of Continental China. He knows for a fact that the Committee of Peking will never participate in competitions where athletes of Taiwan (Formosa) are likely to compete.<sup>210</sup>

Brundage sounded his favourite theme, saying, "It is most regrettable that political conflicts should interfere with our sport business."<sup>211</sup>

G. Loth (Poland) wished to separate politics and sport, and therefore felt that Peking should be recognized and Taiwan rejected "since the latter discusses on a political basis."<sup>212</sup> After several more speakers, whose opinions were not presented in the Minutes, it was decided to send the problem to the Executive Board.<sup>213</sup>

However, that decision did not close the topic at that session. Later, a proposal of the U.S.S.R. Olympic Committee, included in the agenda, was aired, wherein it demanded that "the Olympic Committee having its seat in Taiwan be no longer allowed to control the sport of continental China."<sup>214</sup> The phraseology was most interesting, because, of course, it was impossible for Taiwan to "control" mainland China sport. Regardless of the exact wording, the protest really focussed on the "Chinese Olympic Committee" title. Brundage's rather surprising reply was that he thought "this request is justified. The Russian resolution asks us to annul the recognition of the Olympic Committee of Taiwan and to recognize the one of Peking as the Olympic Committee of the Democratic Republic of China."<sup>215</sup> D. Roby (U.S.A.) was of the opinion that, "nobody can be excluded from the Games and suggests that





we ask the Olympic Committee of Taiwan to change its name which leads to confusion."<sup>216</sup> Again, many speakers made their opinions known, some seeming to support the exclusion of Taiwan and others to believe only a change of name would be necessary. At this point it must not be forgotten that before the time in question Peking had voluntarily withdrawn from the Olympic Movement and the mainland China member (Tung) had resigned from the I.O.C. Therefore, the discussion was not immediately relevant to the position of the Peking Olympic Committee, but it certainly held potential for the future. Finally, the following motion was "adopted by a large majority less 7 votes and a few abstentions."<sup>217</sup>

The Chinese National Olympic Committee having its seat in Taipei (Taiwan) will be notified by the International Olympic Committee chancellor that it cannot continue to be recognized under that name since it does not control sport in the country of China, and its name will be removed from the official list.

If an application for recognition under a different name is made it will be considered by the International Olympic Committee.<sup>218</sup>

Although the Chinese question was not on the agenda of the San Francisco General Assembly of 1960, the issue was brought up by Brundage because "the decision we took in Munich has been wrongly interpreted in various countries on account of the erroneous information diffused by a press agency (U.P.)."<sup>219</sup> Brundage reported that Taiwan had acceded to the I.O.C. request and had proposed a new name, "OLYMPIC COMMITTEE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA. The Executive Board . . . agreed that the name is most suitable since that country is recognized as 'Republic of China' by the United Nations."<sup>220</sup> Many members wished to postpone the discussion to the Rome session being held four months later, but Brundage hoped to settle the difficulty immediately.<sup>221</sup> The subsequent discussion



covered old ground but also included an emphasis on the geographical and political control of the Taiwan government. Roby (U.S.A.) asked about the participation of Taiwan athletes at the Rome Games, and Executive Board member Exeter (Great Britain) replied, "the athletes from that territory are allowed to participate under the name of Taiwan (or of Formosa) . . . .<sup>222</sup> A final decision was deferred to the Rome meeting, but the following press statement was released in an attempt to clarify the situation:

Some two years ago the Olympic Committee in Peking was informed by the International Olympic Committee that the International Olympic Committee could not accept that the Peking Committee was in a position to administer Olympic sport in Taiwan (Formosa). Equally, the Olympic Committee situated in Taipeh was notified that the International Olympic Committee had decided at its meeting in Munich that as the Taipeh Committee was not in a position to administer Olympic sport in mainland China, but did so in Taiwan, its name should be adjusted accordingly. It was therefore decided that its name must be changed to something other than China. It was announced at the International Olympic Committee Session in San Francisco that a decision on this point would be taken at the International Olympic Committee meeting in Rome in August 1960. In the meanwhile, in order that competitors from Taiwan should not be debarred from the Games of the XVIIth Olympiad, the International Olympic Committee authorized its Executive Board to permit entries for Taiwan from the organization which at present calls itself the "Olympic Committee of the Republic of China."

It is hoped that this statement may clear up a situation which has been completely and grossly misrepresented over the past months in certain quarters. It underlines the fact once more that the International Olympic Committee does not concern itself with politics, but with the sporting youth of the world, and as far as international sport organization is concerned, it deals on a factual basis according as to who administers Olympic sports in the area.<sup>223</sup>

At the Rome General Assembly of 1960 there was even more confusion. The Executive Board brought forward its recommendation that the Olympic Committee of Taiwan should be known as the Olympic Committee of the Republic of China, as requested before the San Francisco session.<sup>224</sup>



However, for the present Olympic Games, the team would be called TAIWAN.<sup>225</sup> The latter requirement caused concern to the Italian I.O.C. members and the Rome Organizing Committee, and the following statement was presented by Count di Revel (Italy):

The Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games in Rome received from the International Olympic Committee a list of the Olympic Committees to whom it should send an invitation, and in this list the country you propose to call TAIWAN or FORMOSA figured as National Republic of China. Meanwhile, the International Olympic Committee had taken decisions which invalidate this appellation. Our Organizing Committee maintains that the decision in question can only be effective in the future: the athletes and participants of the National Republic of China came to Rome as guests under this designation. It is very difficult for us to change this name. At all events, we shall leave it to the International Olympic Committee to take the final decision with the consequence and eventual repercussions it may bring.

I wish this statement to figure in the Minutes of this Session exactly as expressed above.<sup>226</sup>

The debate which followed included many of the same arguments uttered at previous I.O.C. sessions, terminating in the motion being accepted 35 to 16 with 2 void papers:

According to the resolution taken by the International Olympic Committee at its Munich Session in 1959, the contingent of athletes coming from TAIWAN will participate in the parade at the Opening Ceremony and in the events under the name of the territory where its Olympic Committee controls Olympic sports, namely TAIWAN. Due note is taken of the fact that the name of the Olympic Committee of TAIWAN which is essentially an internal concern, shall be called in future: Olympic Committee of the Republic of China.<sup>227</sup>

No more was heard of the problem until the 1963 General Assembly when J. Vargas (Phillipines) requested that the team from Taiwan could wear "R.O.C." on their uniforms standing for "National Olympic Committee of Republican China." The motion was carried 34 to 18.<sup>228</sup> The chancellor was to consider the situation and report to the next meeting. No such report was to be found in the subsequent Minutes, but H. Weir



(Australia) put forward a rather contradictory motion only three years later. He proposed that representatives at the Games of the Republic of China should be designated as "China (Taiwan) and, if in future the People's Republic of China should re-join the Olympic Movement, it should be called "China."<sup>229</sup> Before the vote was taken, Weir claimed that the China problem did not differ from that of other split countries, but Stoicheff (Bulgaria) said that "if the I.O.C. granted this proposal we could close the door irremediably to China (Peking) . . . "<sup>230</sup> The motion was rejected 30 to 26.<sup>231</sup>

After all the intense debates about the names of the two Chinas spanning a period of 16 years, the 1968 I.O.C. General Assembly held at Mexico City took its final decision with a minimum of discussion. A vote of 32 to 10 agreed that after November 1, 1968 the teams of Taiwan would be called "Republic of China."<sup>232</sup>

Concomitant with the German and Chinese problems was that of Korea, and the topic bore similar difficulties. In 1947 the I.O.C., with no discussion, recognized the "O.C. of Korea."<sup>233</sup> This group spoke for all of the Korean territory, as at that time Korea was not yet divided. At Melbourne in 1956, the I.O.C. heard from the president that a North Korean application had been received to which the chancellor had responded, suggesting that similar arrangements be made in Korea to those in Germany,<sup>234</sup> meaning a joint team. A. Siperco (Rumania), familiar with the situation in North Korea, believed such agreement would be impossible, and Brundage declared that South Koreans held the same view.<sup>235</sup>

The 1957 General Assembly of the I.O.C. granted provisional





recognition to North Korea, but attached the condition that a united North-South Korean team must be produced for the Games. Failing that, North Korea would not be allowed to compete.<sup>236</sup> The Minutes also noted that, in fact, a state of war still existed between the two areas, and that the I.O.C. had yet to examine the North Korea rules and regulations.<sup>237</sup>

Little progress was made in bringing the two N.O.C.s together and the problem was pursued by eastern European members in 1959 at the Munich General Assembly. Stoicheff (Bulgaria) informed the I.O.C. that the North Korean N.O.C. had attempted to contact their southern counterparts without success, and he proposed that the North Korean N.O.C. be given full recognition.<sup>238</sup> Brundage suggested a meeting be arranged for the two N.O.C.s on neutral territory, and in that interest Stoicheff was asked to send the chancellor copies of the letters addressed from the North Korean N.O.C. to the South Koreans. The latter organization had assured the I.O.C. they had received no such mail.<sup>239</sup> A proposal of the U.S.S.R. would have had the I.O.C. grant recognition to North Korea and then arrange the meeting of the two groups as Andrianov was "given to understand that the Olympic Committee of South Korea is dodging the interview."<sup>240</sup> Brundage said that the I.O.C. held a signed statement assuring that the "South Korean Committee . . . is ready to co-operate in joining a unified team . . . ." <sup>241</sup> It was decided only to arrange the meeting.<sup>242</sup>

At the General Assembly eight months later in San Francisco, Brundage informed the I.O.C. that the meeting had been planned for Hong Kong and accepted by North Korea but refused by South Korea.<sup>243</sup> As a



result the North Korean N.O.C. was asking for separate and final recognition. The I.O.C. decided to postpone a decision until the Rome Assembly.<sup>244</sup> However, later in the session, a possible solution to the issue was proposed by B. Ekelund (Sweden). His idea was to have each N.O.C. send in its entries, including the best times of each athlete in 1959 and 1960. The Athletics Federation would then select the best performers to the maximum entries allowed to a country. Travel and housing arrangements could be solved "in a practical way."<sup>245</sup> The teams would be required to wear the same uniforms and agree on one flag, but if not, they could not "take part in the parade and no Korean flag will be flown in Olympic Stadium."<sup>246</sup> If such agreement could not be reached the blame would be that of the refusing party, not the I.O.C.<sup>247</sup> The Executive Board undertook to examine the matter.<sup>248</sup>

Evidently no progress was made as in Rome Brundage reported that no meeting could be arranged and hoped that "as there had been a change of government in South Korea, the political climate may improve and we can then renew our effort to arrange a meeting between the North and South Korean delegates."<sup>249</sup> As the situation had not changed in 1961, the item was again postponed for another year.<sup>250</sup>

Definite action was taken in 1962: (1) North Korea was provisionally to be accepted; (2) the I.O.C. was to write a letter to the South Korean Committee asking "its opinion with regard to participation at the Games of a unified team . . . . Their reply is due by Sept. 1, 1962";<sup>251</sup> (3) if the reply were negative, North Korea could participate independently at the 1964 Games.<sup>252</sup> Apparently the answer was not encouraging because the I.O.C. General Assembly of 1963 definitely



recognized North Korea.

As with the Chinese problem, the next step after receiving I.O.C. recognition was disagreements as to the name of the Olympic committee and the designation to be placed on the uniforms. The issue was opened in 1964 by the North Koreans asking to be called Korea.<sup>254</sup> The question was deferred and finally settled at the 1968 I.O.C. General Assembly in Mexico City. Previously, North Korea had requested that its name be changed to "Olympic Committee of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."<sup>255</sup> At Mexico City, the South Korea member stated that South Korea would not compete in the Games if North Korea were permitted to have any different name.<sup>256</sup> Brundage undertook to find a compromise and the next day his proposal was unanimously accepted:<sup>257</sup>

It was unanimously resolved at the I.O.C. session that at the Mexico Games the teams entered by the N.O.C. of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will compete as "North Korea". At future Games this team will be designated "D.P.R. Korea". There is no change in the designation of the Korean team. This solution has been agreed by both sides in an Olympic spirit to allow free competition following negotiations with President Avery Brundage.<sup>258</sup>

Chang (Korea) clarified that the name change would take effect November 1, 1968.<sup>259</sup>

Despite the apparent acquiescence of North Korea to the agreement, they evidently did not conform. At an I.O.C. session after the Games had opened, Brundage read a letter from Chang accusing North Korea of,

. . . not participating in the opening ceremony, saying that consequently he regarded this as a violation of the compromise achieved some days earlier and that according to the last paragraph of this agreement he declared it to become null and void.<sup>260</sup>

After some investigation, the I.O.C. released a press statement on



October 14, 1968:

As the North Korean delegation has not abided by the agreement made by their representatives with the I.O.C., the permission to call them Korea--D.P.R.K.--from 1st November, 1968 is withdrawn.<sup>261</sup>

A curious performance took place in 1969 at the General Assembly in Warsaw. Chang claimed that the new name for North Korea was invalid because that country had not participated in the Mexico City Games under the old designation as had been agreed in the 1968 motion<sup>262</sup> (see fn. 258). Completely disregarding its own 1968 press statement (fn. 261), the I.O.C. decided to vote on whether or not such a condition had been stated in the motion. By a count of 28 to 15, with 2 abstentions, the I.O.C. affirmed that the motion was "correct" and that, therefore, North Korea was now known as "D.P.R. Korea."<sup>263</sup> Chang objected and proposed an ad hoc committee so that the matter could be re-discussed at the next General Assembly. His suggestion was rejected.<sup>264</sup> The next year at Amsterdam, Chang was still protesting, but to no avail.<sup>265</sup>

In 1970 the German and Korean issues apparently were resolved to the satisfaction of most of the parties involved. Two German and two Korean N.O.C.s had been recognized by the I.O.C., which permitted the same number of teams to enter the Olympic Games. The People's Republic of China had not returned to the Olympic family and Taiwan continued its involvement. Since the end of World War II, the I.O.C. had been involved almost perpetually in political controversy in its pursuit of internationalism.

Occasionally the I.O.C. had hesitated about accepting the N.O.C.s of countries other than the ones mentioned previously, but, almost exclusively, this has been a case of unsatisfactory rules and





regulations developed by the N.O.C. The difficulty became more obvious after World War II when the "emerging nations" made I.O.C. recognition one of their first symbols of nationhood. Very often these countries had no understanding of Olympism and the unique organization of the I.O.C. The most common hindrance to recognition was government interference in the functioning of the N.O.C., and it was not unusual for the I.O.C. to defer acceptance until there had been a realignment of the motives and membership of the N.O.C. to reduce government control. Often in such cases, an I.O.C. member from a neighbouring country would visit the area to explain the Olympic Movement and the requirements to be fulfilled. The lack of European-style sporting traditions among the peoples of such nations and the necessity for government financing caused the misunderstandings. In most cases the second application for recognition was successful.

Very rarely, an N.O.C. has had its recognition rescinded for a breach of the Olympic rules. Again, such instances usually have been due to government interference in the operation of the N.O.C. caused by a change in the ruling party. These suspensions have seldom lasted for very long, as the I.O.C. has explained the problem and its solution with alacrity and the N.O.C.s have been quick to conform.

#### Racially Based Political Problems

Very occasionally throughout the early history of the modern Olympic Games concern has arisen about racial discrimination. The most serious threat to the Olympic Movement from this source was the attitude of Nazi Germany to Jews at the time of the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin.



The I.O.C. managed to survive that period and no major issues surfaced until the 1950's when sensitivities were more easily aroused by the world-wide efforts for self-government by peoples of many colours and ethnic backgrounds.

Within the Olympic Movement the early signs of concern for equality of opportunity among sportsmen appeared in the mid-1950's. An example of the low-key approach appeared in the Minutes of a meeting of the I.F.s with the I.O.C. Executive Board.<sup>266</sup> Russel (Boxing Federation) called attention to:

. . . the situation existing in some countries, where competitions between coloured boxers and white boxers are not allowed. This being contrary to the Fundamental Olympic Charter . . . the I.O.C. should examine this problem.<sup>267</sup>

The first major airing of racial discrimination charges came at the Rome meeting of the Executive Board with the N.O.C.s in May, 1959. Romanov (U.S.S.R.) mentioned that racial discrimination existed in South Africa where the N.O.C. of that country "has never done anything to prevent it [and] it is an infringement of the Olympic Rules and the International Olympic Committee has never reacted to this state of affairs."<sup>268</sup> Brundage replied that the I.O.C. "will never deviate from the principle . . . that no discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion and politics."<sup>269</sup> He added that the I.O.C. had been corresponding for some time with South Africa about this problem.<sup>270</sup> R. Honey (South Africa) objected to "general accusations directed at his Committee without any tangible proofs."<sup>271</sup> He stated that his committee assisted all athletes of Olympic calibre to take part in the Games.<sup>272</sup>



A week later at the Munich General Assembly of the I.O.C., Honey enlightened the members as to the status of coloured athletes in Africa. He explained that the South African National Olympic Committee (hereinafter called S.A.N.O.C.) had encouraged these athletes to develop sport and that his committee was "on the best of terms with their sport organization."<sup>273</sup> The Olympic rules were strictly applied, according to Honey, and any athlete who was a champion would be a part of an Olympic team and would receive a passport to travel abroad.<sup>274</sup> Porritt (New Zealand) said there had been no sign of racial discrimination by South Africa in the "Games of Great Britain and the Commonwealth."<sup>275</sup> Romanov (U.S.S.R.) stated that he thought "the situation is not as described by Mr. Honey,"<sup>276</sup> and gave examples of foreign teams which had not been allowed "to play against coloured men."<sup>277</sup> Sondhi (India) asked if "a guarantee exist[s] to vouch for the fact that coloured athletes may compete against whites? . . . The mere fact to let them compete only among themselves is a sure sign of discrimination."<sup>278</sup> Brundage believed that everyone was conscious of the problem but that the I.O.C. must have faith in the assurances given by South Africa and trust that they would find a solution.<sup>279</sup>

In 1960 a delegation from South Africa was interviewed by the I.O.C. Evidently some promises were undertaken but details were not included in the Minutes.<sup>280</sup> By 1962 the I.O.C. was unhappy that the assurances given in 1960 had not been carried out and decided to write to the S.A.N.O.C. informing them that,

. . . if the policy of racial discrimination practised by their government in this respect does not change before our Session in Nairobi takes place in October 1963, the International Olympic



Committee will be obliged to suspend this Committee. Decision carried by a vast majority against 5 votes which opted for immediate suspension.<sup>281</sup>

The following year, members of S.A.N.O.C. were received at the 1963 I.O.C. General Assembly. They said "'apartheid' was an internal matter and one which did not concern the International Olympic Committee. The non-white athletes could train among themselves and competitions with white athletes could take place outside South Africa."<sup>282</sup> Non-white athletes chosen for the Tokyo Games would receive passports. The delegation believed that the trouble was being fermented by "political agitators."<sup>283</sup> The I.O.C. response was to carry the following resolution:

That the South African Olympic Committee be told that it must make a firm declaration of its acceptance of the spirit of the Olympic Code and in particular of Principle 1 and Rule 24 read together, and must get from its Government by December 31st 1963 a change in policy regarding racial discrimination in Sports and competitions in its country, failing which the South African National Olympic Committee will be debarred from entering its teams in the Olympic Games.<sup>284</sup>

During the concurrent meeting of N.O.C.s with the I.O.C. Executive Board, a variety of points of view was expressed but generally the eastern European and African representatives were strongly in favour of suspending South Africa.<sup>285</sup> Brundage expressed the belief that, although the I.O.C. could expel or suspend S.A.N.O.C., such action would punish the innocent--the athletes preparing for the Games--and, with others, adjudged the question to be very complex, requiring careful consideration.<sup>286</sup>

As fulfilment of the requirements placed on it at Baden-Baden, the S.A.N.O.C. had appeared at the Executive Board meeting before the





next General Assembly. According to the report made to the Innsbruck General Assembly in 1964, the statement produced had not been satisfactory.<sup>287</sup> As a result, the I.O.C. voted a lengthy resolution reflecting the following points:

1. Approval of S.A.N.O.C.'s guarantee that Olympic team trials would satisfy the I.O.C. even if they must be held outside South Africa.
2. Information that the South African government would issue the necessary travel documents to non-white athletes to attend trials and, if chosen, the Olympic Games. Such action would mean a truly representative team, which showed real progress.
3. That the S.A.N.O.C. had not adequately "collectively, clearly and publicly dissociate[d] itself from the policy of non-competition in sport and non-integration in the administration of sport in South Africa . . . ."<sup>288</sup>
4. The Baden-Baden resolution was therefore enforced and "the invitation to the South African team to compete in Tokyo is withdrawn."<sup>289</sup>
5. The decision may be reconsidered when the S.A.N.O.C. had carried out its duty.<sup>290</sup>

The delegate from S.A.N.O.C. was introduced to the meeting and promised to do his best to fulfil the I.O.C. requirements before the closing date for entries to the Tokyo Games.<sup>291</sup> He was reminded that the S.A.N.O.C. must "openly and officially declare itself to be against apartheid in sport and to be the champions of Olympic ideals



among its people."<sup>292</sup> As no such declaration was forthcoming, South Africa did not compete at the Olympic Games of Tokyo.

Some I.O.C. members were adamant that S.A.N.O.C. should be expelled from Olympic recognition, but the dilemma facing the rest of the group was outlined by Brundage in 1966. He noted that S.A.N.O.C. would be courting its government's sanctions if it violated the laws and had made the public statement demanded by the I.O.C. Expulsion, he feared, would end all of South Africa's connections with the Olympic Movement and irreparably damage the arrangements S.A.N.O.C. was trying to make with the government. He also noted that for the Tokyo Games S.A.N.O.C. had intended to include seven coloured athletes on its team but these athletes subsequently "became professionals and were lost to the Olympic Movement."<sup>293</sup> At this point, the South African delegation was welcomed and explained its plans for a team for the 1968 Olympic Games. First, they supported the Olympic "no discrimination" rule, and then announced that the government had approved a committee of equal numbers of coloured and white officials to select a team and handle all the arrangements.<sup>294</sup> The I.O.C. put off its decision until the next General Assembly to give South Africa time to prove its good intentions and also to send a commission to South Africa to investigate the situation.<sup>295</sup>

The I.O.C. General Assembly at Tehran heard that the Commission for South Africa had not made its visit to that country, and Brundage again stressed,

. . . there is a distinct difference between the Government Policy of Apartheid and racial discrimination in sport. We, as I.O.C., are concerned with the sport situation only, and the I.O.C.



and Olympic Movement may, and can, never be used to change governments.<sup>296</sup>

As at other General Assemblies, the S.A.N.O.C. president, F. Braun, was received and presented a report on "the changes made in sport arrangements in South Africa."<sup>297</sup> Whereas at the meeting the previous year, S.A.N.O.C. had promised only that a joint white and non-white committee would be responsible for a mixed team selection and arrangements, the current statement contained more specific details. The two governing bodies of sport, one white and one non-white, would be integrated "by means of a mixed top administrative body."<sup>298</sup> The South African team, which would be racially mixed, would travel together, live together, "wear the same uniform and emblems and march under the same flag."<sup>299</sup> The I.O.C. decided that the fact-finding commission would visit South Africa and report not later than September 30, 1967, and any further action would be postponed to the General Assembly of February, 1968.<sup>300</sup>

Although the commission report was not included in the Minutes, comments by speakers at the Grenoble General Assembly, in 1968, suggested that it admitted progress for non-white sportsmen, even against a firm government policy of apartheid.<sup>301</sup> The result was a resolution allowing South Africa to compete at the Mexico City Olympic Games of 1968 under the Tehran session proposals, "and on the understanding that it [S.A.N.O.C.] continues vigorously its efforts to have all forms of racial discrimination in amateur sport removed, [and] the I.O.C. will reconsider the question by the end of 1970."<sup>302</sup>

The re-instatement of a South African team set off strong reactions in various sectors of the sporting and non-sporting world. The



Supreme Council for Sport in Africa met with the intention of organizing a boycott of the Mexican Games, and racial disturbances broke out in many locations.<sup>303</sup> The Mexico City Organizing Committee became alarmed and Brundage called an Executive Board meeting at Lausanne.<sup>304</sup> He posed four major points that had to be considered:

- a) The reputation of the I.O.C. and the Olympic Movement.
- b) that of the organizing committee and of the Games.
- c) that of the South African National Olympic Committee.
- d) that of the National Olympic Committee[s] and the International Federations.<sup>305</sup>

During the two days of discussion that followed, many attitudes were exposed based on the duty of the Executive Board to: protect the integrity of the I.O.C.; avoid a breach in the world of amateur sport; save the Mexico Games (the situation was not the fault of the organizing committee); and, "not to yield to any threats of boycotts or to any political pressure."<sup>306</sup> The Executive Board finally agreed that the "presence of a South African team in Mexico would not be wise."<sup>307</sup> The following telegram was sent to I.O.C. members requesting their votes:

IN VIEW OF ALL THE INFORMATION ON THE INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE RECEIVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AT THIS MEETING, IT IS UNANIMOUSLY THE OPINION THAT IT WOULD BE MOST UNWISE FOR A SOUTH AFRICAN TEAM TO PARTICIPATE IN THE GAMES OF THE XIX OLYMPIAD--THEREFORE, THE EXECUTIVE BOARD STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT YOU ENDORSE THIS UNANIMOUS PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW THE INVITATION TO THESE GAMES STOP<sup>308</sup>

When announcing the supportive vote at a press conference, Brundage stressed several points:

It should be emphasized that in adopting this recommendation the International Olympic Committee is not bowing to threats or pressures of any kind from those who do not understand the true Olympic philosophy. Boycott is not a word used in sport circles.





The Executive Board was facing a deep and world-wide cleavage in public opinion that threatened to split the Olympic family and to endanger the success of the XIX Olympiad. It was necessary to reach a decision, and if possible a unanimous decision immediately.

The only point in the lengthy discussions on which the nine members of the Executive Board could agree was, that because of the explosive conditions throughout the world and the ugly demonstrations, rioting, and other violent happenings in many different countries during the last sixty days, there was actual danger if a South African team appeared at the Games.

. . . . .  
 Since our primary concern is the assembly of the youth of all the 125 countries now active in the Olympic Movement, in friendly and peaceful competition, we regret deeply the consequences for the individual participants who had hoped to take part in this Grand Festival of Youth in Mexico City. It is a sad commentary on the state of the world today.<sup>309</sup>

Surprisingly, the Mexico General Assembly Minutes made no mention of the whole affair. However, the Minutes of the 1969 session included an agenda item entitled "Proposal from meeting in Mexico to expel S.A.N.O.C."<sup>310</sup> It was decided that discussion be deferred to the next General Assembly because S.A.N.O.C. had not been officially informed that the topic would be on the agenda and, therefore, had not had time to prepare a defence.<sup>311</sup>

When the issue was approached at the Amsterdam General Assembly in 1970, the history of the problem was reviewed and two important positions were expressed. Brundage admitted that the Executive Board believed,

. . . the international climate was worse than it was before Mexico, therefore it recommended that no invitation be sent to South Africa, in any event until there was an improvement in the international climate.<sup>312</sup>

Exeter (Great Britain) reminded the I.O.C. that the N.O.C.s were responsible for non-discrimination "in regard to the Olympic Games only."<sup>313</sup>

The procedure for hearing the charges against S.A.N.O.C. was



outlined: the representatives of the African N.O.C.s would be given thirty minutes to make their charges; S.A.N.O.C. also would receive thirty minutes to present its defence; then each body would have an additional ten minutes to comment on statements made.<sup>314</sup>

The African delegation began its exposé by submitting eight "violations and infractions to the Olympic Charter by the S.A.N.O.C. as well as the different arguments to justify its exclusion from the I.O.C."<sup>315</sup> The points were quite clear:

1. S.A.N.O.C. had never shown any independence from its government's policy of apartheid and was not "in a position to resist the political pressures of its government."<sup>316</sup>
2. Access to the N.S.G.B.s had never been guaranteed by S.A.N.O.C. to non-white athletes.
3. Non-white sportsmen were not assured equal opportunities for participation in S.A.N.O.C.'s competitive and administrative activities.
4. S.A.N.O.C. had not allowed multi-racial competition nor guaranteed to non-whites "equality of training facilities and installations for the practice of sport . . . ."<sup>317</sup>
5. S.A.N.O.C. had not complied with the I.O.C. Baden-Baden command to "obtain from its government . . . a modification of the policy of discrimination in sport and in competition in its country."<sup>318</sup>
6. In 1969, S.A.N.O.C. had organized international Games to which only white athletes had been invited.
7. For the aforementioned racist Games, S.A.N.O.C. had used



the Olympic emblem without authorization.

8. Nine I.F.s had expelled, suspended, or refused affiliation, to N.S.G.B.s of South Africa connected with S.A.N.O.C. because of their racial discrimination policies.<sup>319</sup>

To support the eight charges laid, the African N.O.C.s quoted sections of the report of the commission which had visited South Africa in 1968, as well as various other documents.<sup>320</sup>

When S.A.N.O.C. had its turn, it was not able to present a similarly academic and non-emotional statement. Mainly, the S.A.N.O.C. defence was based on interpretations of Coubertin's intentions, accusations that the I.O.C. had violated its own rules, and complaints that many countries crusading against South Africa themselves were guilty of political discrimination.<sup>321</sup> One most interesting revelation was that Brundage, before the Mexico Games, had consulted an "eminent procedural lawyer" in the U.S.A. who had warned:

Any resolution denying South Africa the opportunity of participating in the 1968 Olympic Games because of its form of political and economic society would be discriminating against that country and its athletes on the basis of political affiliation. Such an act would be in clear violation of Rule 1 of the Olympic Charter.<sup>322</sup>

S.A.N.O.C. concentrated on this opinion, but it appeared to have committed a grave error in challenging the righteousness of the I.O.C.'s earlier actions. Brundage flatly objected and denied that the I.O.C. had violated any of its own rules or had buckled under the threat of Games boycotts.

After I.O.C. members had interrogated both delegations, the question was called: "Do you agree to the withdrawal of recognition of S.A.N.O.C.?"<sup>324</sup> Of 66 votes cast, 35 were affirmative, 28 against,



and 3 blank ballots.<sup>325</sup> South Africa was expelled from the Olympic Movement and automatically eliminated from Olympic Games participation.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 12

<sup>1</sup>International Olympic Committee, "Minutes of the General Assembly: The Hague, 1907" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1907), as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 18 (June, 1907), 278.

<sup>2</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1921" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1921), June 6.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., Oslo, 1952, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., Helsinki, 1952, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., Mexico City, 1953, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., Cortina D'Ampezzo, 1956, n.p.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., Antwerp, 1920, August 23.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., Lausanne, 1921, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., Paris, 1922, p. 14.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 20-21.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., Rome, 1923, p. 12.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>18</sup>Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 101.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.



<sup>22</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Paris, 1924," p. 5.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>24</sup>Mayer, p. 108.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Paris, 1924," p. 20.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., Lisbon, 1926, May 6, morning.

<sup>29</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1929," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 13 (July, 1929), 4.

<sup>30</sup>I.O.C., "The Ninth Far Eastern Games," *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 17 (March, 1931), 14.

<sup>31</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 7.

<sup>32</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1936," p. 1.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., Lausanne, 1946, September 5, Item 7.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., Item 12.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., Stockholm, 1947, p. 6.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., St. Moritz, 1948, p. 31.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., Rome, 1949, p. 11.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., Oslo, 1952, App. 4.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., Helsinki, 1952, p. 26.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 27.



<sup>46</sup>Ibid., Barcelona, 1955, p. 42.

<sup>47</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Innsbruck, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 86 (May, 1964), 66.

<sup>48</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Madrid, 1965," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 92 (November, 1965), 75.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tehran, 1967," p. 8.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., Stockholm, 1947, p. 11.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., St. Moritz, 1948, p. 20.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., London, 1948, p. 13.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., Rome, 1949, p. 11.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., Copenhagen, 1950, pp. 22-23.

<sup>58</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1967, p. 87.

<sup>59</sup>Jean Ketseas as quoted in Otto Szymiczek, "The International Olympic Academy: Its History, Achievements, Objectives," *The International Olympic Academy: Fourth Session, Aug. 1964, Olympia, Greece* (Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1969), p. 49.

<sup>60</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Cairo, 1938," March 16.

<sup>61</sup>Szymiczek, pp. 49-50.

<sup>62</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1946," September 5, Item 11.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., Stockholm, 1947, p. 11.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., London, 1948, p. 14.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., Rome, 1949, April 28, Item 15.

<sup>66</sup>Szymiczek, p. 50.

<sup>67</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Paris, 1955," p. 64.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., Sofia, 1957, p. 14.



<sup>69</sup>Szymiczek, p. 50.

<sup>70</sup>International Olympic Academy and George of Hanover (eds.), *Olympia: And the International Olympic Academy* (Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, n.d. [ca. 1972], p. 13.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>72</sup>The writer has been a participant of Academy programs on three occasions.

<sup>73</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1923," p. 27.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, Athens, 1934, p. 8.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, Vienna, 1933, pp. 4-5; see also *ibid.*, Athens, 1934, pp. 8-9.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.*, Athens, 1934, p. 13.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*, Melbourne, 1956, p. 3.

<sup>78</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Melbourne, 1956," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 58 (May, 1957), 46.

<sup>79</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Melbourne, 1956," p. 4.

<sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Melbourne, 1956," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 58 (May, 1957), 46.

<sup>82</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Melbourne, 1956," pp. 4-5.

<sup>84</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*, Tehran, 1967, App. II(III).

<sup>86</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, App. IV.

<sup>88</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . San Francisco, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 70 (May, 1960), 50.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 50, 52.

<sup>90</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 52.





<sup>91</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Madrid, 1965," Item 16.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., App. 2.

<sup>96</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 12.

<sup>97</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1953," p. 6.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., Paris, 1955, p. 52.

<sup>99</sup>I.O.C., "Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with Delegates of the N.O.C.s and I.F.s: Evian, 1957," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 61 (February, 1958), 65.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid.

<sup>101</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Sofia, 1957," p. 13.

<sup>102</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1961," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 74.

<sup>103</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 70.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid.

<sup>105</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Madrid, 1965," App. 4.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid.

<sup>107</sup>Ibid.

<sup>108</sup>Ibid.

<sup>109</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1968," App. XI.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.

<sup>112</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, pp. 36-37.

<sup>113</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1919," April 5.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid.



<sup>115</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Aix-en-Provence: Paul Roubaud, 1931), pp. 156-157.

<sup>116</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1923," April 8.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., Lausanne, 1946, p. 15.

<sup>118</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, p. 12.

<sup>119</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Lausanne, 1921," June 5; see also I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1923," April 8.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., Antwerp, 1920, August 17.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., Lausanne, 1921, June 5.

<sup>122</sup>Ibid., London, 1948, p. 14.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., Vienna, 1951, p. 22.

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., London, 1948, p. 2.

<sup>125</sup>Ibid.

<sup>126</sup>Ibid., Vienna, 1951, p. 12.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., Oslo, 1952, p. 3.

<sup>128</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Copenhagen, 1950," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 21-22 (June-August, 1950), 14.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Vienna, 1951," p. 15.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-18.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>135</sup>Ibid., pp. 17, 18.

<sup>136</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>137</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1952," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 32 (March, 1952), 11.

<sup>138</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1952," App. 2.



139 Ibid., Helsinki, 1952, App. 6.

140 Ibid., p. 12.

141 Ibid., pp. 12-13.

142 Ibid., p. 14.

143 Ibid.

144 Ibid., p. 15.

145 Ibid., Mexico City, 1953, p. 26.

146 Ibid., Athens, 1954, p. 22.

147 Ibid., p. 23.

148 Ibid.

149 Ibid.

150 Ibid.

151 Ibid., Paris, 1955, pp. 65, 69.

152 Ibid., Cortina d'Ampezzo, 1956, pp. 29-30.

153 Ibid., p. 30.

154 Ibid.

155 Ibid.

156 I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), App. 5, p. 73.

157 Ibid., p. 70.

158 I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Madrid, 1965," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 92 (November, 1965), 77.

159 Ibid.

160 Ibid.

161 Ibid., App. 2.

162 I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1968," p. 22.

163 I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1967, p. 80.



<sup>164</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1952," p. 7.

<sup>165</sup>Mayer, p. 208; see also *ibid.*, pp. 211-212.

<sup>166</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1952," p. 7.

<sup>167</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>168</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>169</sup>*Ibid.*, attached page.

<sup>170</sup>*Ibid.*, attached page.

<sup>171</sup>*Ibid.*, attached page.

<sup>172</sup>*Ibid.*, Helsinki, 1952, p. 7.

<sup>173</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>174</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>175</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>176</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee of the I.O.C. with Delegates of the I.F.s: Helsinki, 1952," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 34-35 (July-September, 1952), 32.

<sup>177</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Helsinki, 1952," App. 3, 4.

<sup>178</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 1, App. 4, p. 1.

<sup>179</sup>*Ibid.*, App. 4, pp. 1, 2, 3, 4.

<sup>180</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>181</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>182</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>183</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>184</sup>*Ibid.*, Mexico City, 1953, p. 25.

<sup>185</sup>Dick Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Ballantine Books, 1976), p. 250.

<sup>186</sup>Monique Berlioux, "The History of the International Olympic Committee," *The Olympic Games: 80 Years of People, Events and Records*, eds. Lord Killanin and John Rodda (Don Mills, Ont.: Collier-Macmillan Canada, 1976), p. 19.





<sup>187</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1953," p. 25.

<sup>188</sup>Ibid., pp. 25-26.

<sup>189</sup>Ibid., Athens, 1954, p. 23.

<sup>190</sup>Ibid.

<sup>191</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>192</sup>Ibid.

<sup>193</sup>Ibid., Paris, 1955, p. 20.

<sup>194</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Cortina d'Ampezzo, 1956," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 54 (May, 1956), 46.

<sup>195</sup>Ibid.

<sup>196</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>197</sup>Ibid.

<sup>198</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Melbourne, 1956," p. 3.

<sup>199</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>200</sup>Ibid.

<sup>201</sup>Ibid., Sofia, 1957, p. 4.

<sup>202</sup>Ibid.

<sup>203</sup>Berlioux, p. 19.

<sup>204</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Munich, 1959, p. 3.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid., pp. 3-4.

<sup>206</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>207</sup>Ibid.

<sup>208</sup>Ibid.

<sup>209</sup>Ibid.

<sup>210</sup>Ibid.

<sup>211</sup>Ibid.



<sup>212</sup>Ibid., Munich, 1959, p. 4.

<sup>213</sup>Ibid.

<sup>214</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>215</sup>Ibid.

<sup>216</sup>Ibid.

<sup>217</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>218</sup>Ibid.

<sup>219</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . San Francisco, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 70 (May, 1960), 47.

<sup>220</sup>Ibid.

<sup>221</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>222</sup>Ibid.

<sup>223</sup>Ibid.

<sup>224</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 64.

<sup>225</sup>Ibid.

<sup>226</sup>Ibid.

<sup>227</sup>Ibid.

<sup>228</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 70.

<sup>229</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), App. 16.

<sup>230</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>231</sup>Ibid.

<sup>232</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1968," p. 21.

<sup>233</sup>Ibid., Stockholm, 1947, p. 9.

<sup>234</sup>Ibid., Melbourne, 1956, p. 9.

<sup>235</sup>Ibid.



<sup>236</sup>Ibid., Sofia, 1957, p. 4.

<sup>237</sup>Ibid.

<sup>238</sup>Ibid., Munich, 1959, p. 3.

<sup>239</sup>Ibid.

<sup>240</sup>Ibid.

<sup>241</sup>Ibid.

<sup>242</sup>Ibid.

<sup>243</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . San Francisco, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 70 (May, 1960), 50.

<sup>244</sup>Ibid.

<sup>245</sup>Ibid., App. 7.

<sup>246</sup>Ibid.

<sup>247</sup>Ibid.

<sup>248</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>249</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 66.

<sup>250</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Athens, 1961," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 79.

<sup>251</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Moscow, 1962," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 80 (November, 1962), 47.

<sup>252</sup>Ibid.

<sup>253</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 70.

<sup>254</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Innsbruck, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 86 (May, 1964), 69.

<sup>255</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Grenoble, 1968," p. 13.

<sup>256</sup>Ibid., Mexico City, 1968, p. 20.

<sup>257</sup>Ibid.

<sup>258</sup>Ibid., App. 13.



<sup>259</sup>Ibid., Mexico City, 1968, p. 20.

<sup>260</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>261</sup>Ibid.

<sup>262</sup>Ibid., Warsaw, 1969, p. 2.

<sup>263</sup>Ibid.

<sup>264</sup>Ibid.

<sup>265</sup>Ibid., Amsterdam, 1970, p. 1.

<sup>266</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the Conference of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Delegates of the I.F.s, Paris, 1955," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 52 (November, 1955), 38.

<sup>267</sup>Ibid.

<sup>268</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Delegates of the N.O.C.s, Rome, May 19, 1959," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 67 (August, 1959), 66.

<sup>269</sup>Ibid.

<sup>270</sup>Ibid.

<sup>271</sup>Ibid.

<sup>272</sup>Ibid.

<sup>273</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Munich, 1959," p. 14.

<sup>274</sup>Ibid.

<sup>275</sup>Ibid.

<sup>276</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>277</sup>Ibid.

<sup>278</sup>Ibid.

<sup>279</sup>Ibid.

<sup>280</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 66.

<sup>281</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Moscow, 1962," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 80 (November, 1962), 48.





<sup>282</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 71.

<sup>283</sup>Ibid.

<sup>284</sup>Ibid. "Principle 1" is Fundamental Principle 1, in I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1962), p. 5. The sentence referred to reads: "No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or political affiliation." "Rule 24" is directions to N.O.C.s, in I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1962, p. 12. The sentence referred to reads: "National Olympic Committees must not associate themselves with matters of a political or commercial nature." Nota Bene: Rule 25 (which was not mentioned) states: "National Olympic Committees must be completely autonomous and in a position to resist all political, religious or commercial pressure," in I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1962, p. 14.

<sup>285</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Representatives of the N.O.C.s, Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 76-78.

<sup>286</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>287</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Innsbruck, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 86 (May, 1964), 65.

<sup>288</sup>Ibid., App. 3.

<sup>289</sup>Ibid.

<sup>290</sup>Ibid.

<sup>291</sup>Ibid.

<sup>292</sup>Ibid.

<sup>293</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1966," p. 14.

<sup>294</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15.

<sup>295</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>296</sup>Ibid., Tehran, 1967, p. 9.

<sup>297</sup>Ibid.

<sup>298</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>299</sup>Ibid.

<sup>300</sup>Ibid.



<sup>301</sup>Ibid., Grenoble, 1968, pp. 6-7.

<sup>302</sup>Ibid., App. 6.

<sup>303</sup>[I.O.C.] "Mexico Without the South Africans," *I.O.C. Newsletter*, 8 (May, 1968), 147.

<sup>304</sup>Berlioux, p. 18.

<sup>305</sup>*Newsletter*, p. 147.

<sup>306</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>307</sup>Ibid.

<sup>308</sup>Ibid.

<sup>309</sup>Ibid., pp. 149-150.

<sup>310</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Warsaw, 1969," p. 6.

<sup>311</sup>Ibid.

<sup>312</sup>Ibid., Amsterdam, 1970, p. 26.

<sup>313</sup>Ibid.

<sup>314</sup>Ibid.

<sup>315</sup>Ibid., App. 30A.

<sup>316</sup>Ibid.

<sup>317</sup>Ibid.

<sup>318</sup>Ibid.

<sup>319</sup>Ibid.

<sup>320</sup>Ibid., App. 30B.

<sup>321</sup>Ibid.

<sup>322</sup>Ibid.

<sup>323</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>324</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>325</sup>Ibid.



## CHAPTER 13

### ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TOWARD AESTHETICS AND ARTS AND LETTERS

Throughout his career, Baron de Coubertin was dedicated to cementing sport and arts and letters in a harmonious cultural relationship. Art, music, sculpture, and poetry should, he felt, exalt the athlete who, in turn, contributed his agility, perfect form, and grace to the world of beauty. Coubertin was determined that the modern Olympic Games would inspire the unification of these two elements of culture which had been separated since the days of the ancient Olympic festivals. He venerated the Greek view of sport as a culture to be extolled by the great artists, orators, and poets, and was resolved to cultivate such sentiments in modern society.

The earliest action taken to launch arts and letters as an aesthetic aspect of the Olympic Games was the convening of a "Consultative Conference on Arts, Letters and Sports" in the spring of 1906 at the Comédie-Français in Paris.<sup>1</sup> The major decision reached at this meeting was that competitions in five areas would be offered: architecture, sculpture, painting, literature, and music.<sup>2</sup> To stress the importance of these contests as part of the Olympic festival, medals would be given to the winners who would be selected by international juries. The works submitted had to be "inspired by the idea of sport or refer indirectly to sporting activities."<sup>3</sup>

The first art competitions were held at the Stockholm Olympic



Games in 1912, although apparently plans were laid to institute these contests for the 1908 Games in London. A report in the *Review Olympique* in 1907 described the regulations for the areas of painting, sculpture, and architecture. One of the categories in both painting and sculpture requested a frieze 10 feet long by 4 feet wide. The report also suggested topics from Greek sport history. In architecture, entries would be accepted in three categories, one of which required a design for "A town house . . . [with] provision for a fully fitted private gymnasium."<sup>4</sup> The planners of the art competitions appeared to be aiming at topics for the élite. Because of the "short time . . . to organize the games in London . . . "<sup>5</sup>(they had originally been granted to Rome), these contests were never held, so "arts and letters" in Olympic Games had its début in 1912. The new element appears to have been fairly successful, but it was the beginning of some problems which were to plague the I.O.C. for many years. The Olympic competitions never attracted the cream of international artists; there were some criticisms of the judging; and, finally, a basic philosophical controversy arose because many artists were not amateurs.

In 1923, "art competitions" were included for the first time in the list of required activities for the Olympic Games.<sup>6</sup> At the I.O.C. meeting that year some difficulties were exposed which presaged the eventual demise of the artistic contests. Polignac (France) reported details about the program for arts and letters at the Paris Games the following year, describing two major problems: the selection of judges, and the artists' preference for exhibitions and demonstrations.<sup>7</sup> However, because the artistic manifestations best symbolized, in the eyes





of the public, the ideal of the cultural totality of the Olympic Games, the contests would be continued, but would be enriched by non-competitive displays. Later in the session only Edström voted against maintaining the arts and letters competitions as part of the obligatory Olympic program.<sup>9</sup>

Polignac's report at the 1924 I.O.C. meeting suggested that the artistic facet of the Paris Olympic Games included appearances of professional music and theatre groups, turning the total presentation into a "season of art of the VIIIth Olympiad."<sup>10</sup> He also referred, again, to the problem of finding judges. Another suggestion was that, at least in architecture, plans, photos, and models of all buildings (pools, gymnasias, stadiums, and so on) constructed since the last Olympic Games, be included in the competition. This type of project would mean that the works entered "would not be designed with the judges' opinions in mind, but to serve a definite purpose."<sup>11</sup> There was not full agreement on this proposal and Clary (France) submitted the idea of having the I.O.C. members act as a jury to choose those entries which conformed to the "Olympic character." The final awarding of medals would be made by a group of technically competent judges. The I.O.C. approved this scheme and sent it to the Executive Board to devise the operative procedures.<sup>12</sup> Early in the discussion, President Coubertin had observed,

The world does not yet understand the importance of Letters and Arts in the Olympic Games but the idea is spreading little by little and the celebration of the VIIIth Olympiad marks a great step in this direction.<sup>13</sup>

Little attention was paid by the I.O.C. to the cause of arts



and letters in the next decade, except to approve the plans for each Olympic festival and, in 1930, to restrict the submissions to works "executed during the four years of the preceding Olympiad."<sup>14</sup> Following up his 1923 vote against compulsory art contests, Edström, in 1935, protested that "the art competitions, in which only professionals compete, are not in harmony with the idea of amateurism which inspires the Olympic Games."<sup>15</sup> His complaint evidently fell on deaf ears as no reactions for or against the statement were noted in the Minutes.

The Olympic competitions in arts and letters appear to have disappeared quietly from the scene. The last presentation was part of the 1948 Olympics in London, and, as none of the enduring problems had been solved, the I.O.C. meeting in the subsequent year agreed to new rules which changed the art contests to demonstrations and exhibitions. The members apparently accepted, without discussion, a recommendation of a committee chaired by Brundage that had been charged to investigate ways to reduce criticisms of the I.O.C. One of the points made was that "Olympic medals should not be given for the art competitions as the artists are professionals."<sup>16</sup> Therefore, from the 1952 Helsinki Olympic festival until the present time, the host city has been required to organize fine arts displays but not contests.

As soon as the competitions were removed from the Olympic program, individual members and outside groups expressed desires for their restoration. The Helsinki Organizing Committee preferred competitions to exhibitions, but were ordered to comply with the new rules.<sup>17</sup> One year later at the 1951 General Assembly, the I.O.C. appeared to reverse itself<sup>18</sup> in response to requests from several



members, but later in the same session the Finnish member objected to the change as it would be impossible for Helsinki now to initiate a competitive situation.<sup>19</sup> No further discussion ensued and only a few artistic displays were offered at Helsinki.

In 1952 the entire issue was sent to the Executive Board for study, with three possible solutions suggested: "hold art competitions [either] with or without medals; hold art exhibitions; do away with art competitions altogether."<sup>20</sup> The Executive Board must have had too many other problems because no proper report was made to the General Assembly. During the 1953 meeting, President Brundage expressed his views on the subject, reiterating his strong conviction that in the art competition Olympic medals had been going to professionals. He explained: "If we continue this system we shall commercialize Olympism, for the artists have a right to sell their works which have been awarded a prize." He proposed that a committee should review the issue and report in 1954.<sup>21</sup>

The committee performed no better than had the Executive Board, as they had no response ready for the I.O.C. meeting at Athens. Brundage put forth a suggestion that each organizing committee plan exhibitions of a type and content that it desired. The I.O.C. agreed to this, but added a restriction: "It is specified that the question of amateurism will not be posed in relation to these Fine Arts expositions. Also, only diplomas will be distributed, not medals."<sup>22</sup>

In 1956, F. Mezo (Hungary) regretted the lack of emphasis on the fine arts program. He was asked to write an article for the *Bulletin* and was assured that the subject would be placed on the agenda



of the next session.<sup>23</sup> It was not, but in the following two General Assemblies the organizing committee for the Rome Olympics was impressed with the fact that the I.O.C. had expectations of an exceptionally high standard for the fine arts exhibitions to be presented in 1960.<sup>24</sup> Mezo, at the San Francisco meeting of 1960, again raised the question of art contests, asking that the I.O.C. revert to a competitive situation. Nothing was done.<sup>25</sup>

A rather perplexing proposal was made in 1960 by the U.S.S.R. I.O.C. members. They recommended that Rule 31 on "Fine Arts" be changed by substituting the word "exhibition" for "competition" (the 1958 *Olympic Rules and Regulations* already used "exhibition"),<sup>26</sup> and by adding new instructions:

Authors of [the] best works, which participate in the Competition [?], shall be given gold, silver and bronze medals and diplomas. Winners shall be chosen by the competent juries of experts to be appointed by the International Olympic Committee.<sup>27</sup>

If the confusion surrounding the disposal of the arts and letters question was affecting the proposers of the motion, there was no doubt about the I.O.C.'s reaction, as it flatly rejected the motion.<sup>28</sup>

If the I.O.C. appeared unwilling to get involved in a fine arts controversy, the other allied organizations were, evidently, completely disinterested. In 1963, at a meeting of the I.O.C. Executive Board with the N.O.C.s, Brundage reviewed the history of arts and letters within the Olympic Games and ended by praising the exhibition which had been organized for the 1960 Rome Games. The Minutes bluntly stated, "A debate was allowed, but nobody wished to speak."<sup>29</sup>

The topic of arts and letters was reopened in 1968, although





the Minute reference was now to a "cultural" program. The item was sent to a new Cultural Commission for study.<sup>30</sup> The report presented by W. Reczek (Poland) affirmed the necessity for enriching the Olympic Games by "cultural and artistic elements to encourage "the spiritual and cultural [development] of the participants in the Games and . . . contributing to the promotion of the Olympic Ideal in the world."<sup>31</sup> The submission observed that the accent should be placed on national demonstrations but international involvement should be welcomed as long as the displays were free from racial, religious, or political association.<sup>32</sup> The commission also urged artistic exhibitions in the Olympic village, inviting eminent artists to the Games so they would be inspired by sport, and avoiding, in all radio and television broadcasts, "all commercial aspects and in particular, the improper use of advertising and publicity . . . ."<sup>33</sup> Concerning the N.O.C.s, the report asked them to create cultural commissions to raise the interest of youth, particularly athletes, in art, and to familiarize artists with sport subjects. The only direct action requested of the I.O.C. was a recommendation that the Olympic Museum in Lausanne be revitalized.<sup>34</sup> In 1970, the commission revealed that contacts with some N.O.C.s had resulted in the commission supporting the suppression of competitions in art. Otherwise, no new recommendations were forthcoming.<sup>35</sup>

The connection of aesthetic elements with the Olympic Games was an indispensable factor of Olympism as Coubertin envisioned it. I.O.C. efforts to fulfil this conception appear to have been circumscribed by problems involving amateurism and a certain disinterest on the part of proven artists. Of late, Olympic Games organizing



committees have been required to arrange:

. . . exhibitions and demonstrations of the National Fine Arts (Architecture, Literature, Music, Painting, Sculpture, Photography and Sport Philately) . . . . The program may also include Theatrical, Ballet, Opera Performances or Symphony concerts. This section of the program should be of the same high standard as the sport events and be held concurrently with them in the same vicinity. It shall receive full recognition in the publicity released by the Organizing Committee.<sup>36</sup>

Despite such statements it is rare for the arts and letters aspect of the Olympic Games to attain a prominent position in the Olympic festival.



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 13

<sup>1</sup>Otto Mayer, *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques* (Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960), p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Pierre de Coubertin, "Arts, Letters and Sport," *Cultures*, 1(2), UNESCO and la Baconnière (1973), 164.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>[I.O.C.] "Olympic Competitions in Painting, Sculpture and Architecture for 1908," *Revue Olympique*, 22 (October, 1907), 343.

<sup>5</sup>British Olympic Council, *The Fourth Olympiad: London, 1908, Official Report*, ed. Theodore Andrea Cook (London: British Olympic Association, 1908), p. 383.

<sup>6</sup>International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Rules and Regulations*, (Lausanne: The Committee, 1923), p. 3.

<sup>7</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1923" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1923), p. 9.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, Paris, 1924, p. 23.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>14</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Berlin, 1930," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 16 (June, 1930), 18.

<sup>15</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1935," p. 11.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, London, 1948, p. 2 of attached report.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, Copenhagen, 1950, p. 7.

<sup>18</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Vienna, 1951," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 27 (June, 1951), 12.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.



<sup>20</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Oslo, 1952," p. 7.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., Mexico City, 1953, p. 18.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., Athens, 1954, p. 14.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., Melbourne, 1956, p. 10

<sup>24</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Sofia, 1957," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 61 (February, 1958), 76; see also I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Tokyo, 1958," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 63 (August, 1958), 40.

<sup>25</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . San Francisco, 1960," p. 9.

<sup>26</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1958, p. 21.

<sup>27</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), p. 67, App. 2.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>29</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes [of] Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the representatives of the N.O.C.s Kurhaus-Baden-Baden (Germany) October 15, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 80.

<sup>30</sup>I.O.C., "Minutes . . . Mexico City, 1968," p. 27.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., Warsaw, 1969, p. 1, App. 23.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 2, App. 23.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-2, App. 23.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., Amsterdam, 1970, p. 1, App. 15.

<sup>36</sup>I.O.C., . . . *Regulations*, 1971, pp. 23-24.





PART IV  
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS



## CHAPTER 14

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

#### DISCUSSION

##### Introduction

As the policy-setting body governing the Olympic Games, the I.O.C., through its decisions, affects the lives of every amateur sportsman in the world. Even at local levels, the rules and regulations for minor competitions are influenced by behaviours and standards which are acceptable to the I.O.C. and which, therefore, would permit possible future entry of the young athlete into the Olympic Games. Furthermore, through the development of modern methods of instant communication, the Olympic festival reaches millions of spectators who, previously, were unable to share the excitement.

Despite the resulting impression that the Olympic Games belong to the world, the I.O.C. is not a representative body. The members supposedly owe no allegiance to governments or sporting groups. Neither is there any superior body to oversee the work of the I.O.C. Complete autonomy in all aspects of the Olympic Movement is the I.O.C. privilege. Nevertheless, the fame and prestige of the Olympic Games obligates the I.O.C. to a certain degree of accountability for its actions. If this is not true, then the wide-spread criticism of the I.O.C.'s self-recruiting method of selecting members would be fully justified. The suggestion, often made, that the I.O.C. should be a completely democratic



body by having N.O.C. and I.F. representatives compose the membership, would produce a group of an unmanageable size. Also, because each delegate would be required to speak for his supportive body, no detachment could exist. Unquestionably, the I.O.C. would fall into the same morass so evident in the United Nations today.

Throughout the history of the organization, I.O.C. spokesmen have insisted that the Olympic Games was far more than a sports meet; that the Olympic festival was really a celebration of a sporting ideology. In the early years, this creed was referred to as the "Olympic Idea" or "Ideal," and seemed to be a modern version of the Greek ideal of the whole man, physically, mentally, and aesthetically integrated. Later, the word "Olympism" was more commonly used, but by then it appeared to incorporate additional connotations. The source of the philosophical meanings of these phrases was Pierre de Coubertin, the founder of the modern Olympic Games. Although Coubertin had very strong ideas about the role of sport in man's life, his plentiful public statements seemed to emphasize one facet or another of Olympism. Neither he nor his Olympic heirs produced a comprehensive definition to guide the world's understanding of the Olympic purpose.

A study of Coubertin's statements suggest that he accepted the Greek ideal of physical skill combined with an appreciation for beauty and knowledge. To these, Coubertin attached a British conviction that sport built moral character, and his own idea that international competition would encourage world peace and understanding. Only the amateur athlete, who competed for the sake of sport, not financial gain, could fully bring all these factors together as a personal testimony to the



ideal. The aim of the Olympic Games was based on the concept that high level competitive sport, epitomized by the Olympic Games, must grow out of "sport for all" and, therefore, should display Olympism at its zenith of achievement, a concept that was never fully grasped by the public or achieved by the Olympic Games festival.

As the autonomous body responsible for spreading knowledge of Olympism throughout the sporting world, the I.O.C.'s actions must be analysed according to the degree of achievement of that goal. What *has* the I.O.C. done in promoting amateurism, physical and character (moral) development, internationalism, and aesthetics and arts and letters?

#### Amateurism

The most pervasive and thorny problem the I.O.C. has faced over its eighty years has been amateurism. Although insistence on the amateur qualification for entry into the Olympic Games existed from the first days of the committee's life, no I.O.C. definition was developed until the Congress of Prague in 1925. For the previous ten years, the only directive was that the I.F.s had the sole right to establish the terms of amateur qualification. It is noteworthy that the first firm instruction in the I.O.C. rules was concerned with the payment of a competing athlete's lost salary. The changing attitudes of society and, to a lesser degree, the I.O.C., are most noticeable in the I.O.C. rules as they affect the amateur factors of broken time payment, expense money (including training camps), and the development of state amateurs.

The determination of the I.O.C. to prohibit broken time payments





has a curious background. Shortly after its founding, the I.O.C. adopted a byword: "all games, all nations, all men,"<sup>1</sup> to guide its policy decisions. The injunction against broken time would seem to contradict this sentiment, since many athletes would be unable to afford to attend the Olympic Games. The convenient and most common criticism has been to blame the élite class backgrounds of the I.O.C. members, and to claim that they wished to retain Olympic competition for the upper socio-economic classes. No doubt there was hesitation concerning the potential behaviour of lower-class athletes, but the major worry seemed to centre on the slow expansion to full professionalism that any easing of restrictions might permit. If the athlete received recompense for his time at Olympic competition he would then want the same privilege for non-Olympic contests, for his travel, and for his training time. That, of course, is exactly what has happened, even though the I.O.C. tried to effect tight controls over the circumstances under which broken time might be permissible. Admittedly, the I.O.C.'s attitude slowed the full involvement of the working class in high level competition that required much time and travel.

Another facet of the broken time controversy has been the contradiction exposed by the I.O.C.'s insistence on pure amateurism and its simultaneous espousal of the motto *Citius, Altius, Fortius*. After World War II, if not before, it was obvious that the achievement of records required most athletes to spend more time in training and competition than was possible if they held full-time jobs. Only those with private financial resources could afford the time for training. Therefore, few young people could ever hope to compete in the Olympic



Games, and it would be discrimination if the rigidity of the Olympic rules were to deny them such opportunity. During this period, the I.O.C. was still protesting against broken time payments while simultaneously promoting the *Citius, Altius, Fortius* motto. More than ten years ago, W. Umminger suggested that the motto had been "taken too literally."<sup>2</sup> He contended that the I.O.C. should re-interpret the words so that,

. . . citius stands for "do something worthwhile faster," altius for "raise your thoughts higher" and fortius for "be stronger against the temptations of materialism."<sup>3</sup>

Umminger felt that, without such an understanding, the dignity of the Olympic Games could not be maintained and they would continue to decline from inspirational events to simple spectacles.<sup>4</sup> The I.O.C. continues to take pride in Olympic records when, obviously, the literal translation of the motto is in complete opposition to amateurism.

The issue of expense money for travel and competition really has two areas of difficulty. One is the payment of the expenses of an athlete by his N.S.G.B. and N.O.C. The other encompasses expenses incurred by an athlete to attend various invitational meets where his N.S.G.B. is not involved. The I.O.C. has little direct control over such situations but has been affected by them. Often the athlete can obtain "appearance" money from the meet promoters, as his attendance will increase the prestige of the meet and, therefore, affect the gate returns. The I.O.C. simply refers to such practices as receiving expense money over the amount of actual outlay, and has occasionally disqualified athletes who allegedly succumbed to these temptations. Both Paavo Nurmi and Dan Waern were examples of such disciplinary



action taken by the I.F. or the I.O.C.

Training camps have been another problem very difficult to control. The I.O.C. was reluctant to allow training camps, obviously because this time, added to travel and competition, made it increasingly difficult to assure that an athlete had a bona fide job, and if he did not, then he must be receiving remuneration for his sport skills. Permission for training camps appeared to be a case of the I.O.C. bowing to the inevitable.

To the Western mind, the situation of the "state amateur" of the "People's Democracies" exemplifies the predilection of the I.O.C. to say one thing but do another. No Canadian, for example, has been able to understand why the U.S.S.R. hockey players are not considered to be professionals. However, the I.O.C. allows their entry into the Olympic Games while forbidding that of the Canadian professionals. The crux of the matter would seem to be the source and extent of the financial benefits to the player. If free enterprise is the money source, it is illegal, but if government is the source, it is acceptable. However, supporters of the I.O.C.'s position make a different interpretation. They claim that the amount the player obtains in the eastern European system is at the living expense level only, while the North American professional makes financial gains far above his living needs. Also, they explain that the sport has become a profession for the Western athlete whereas the eastern European has some other profession such as the military, school-teaching, engineering, and so on. As the I.O.C. has continually stressed the fact that the amateur is a person with a non-sport profession, this explanation could well be the one the I.O.C.



employs to justify its acceptance of the "state amateur." Doubtless, the money made by the sport promoter under the capitalistic system also discomfits the I.O.C. On the other hand, the "state amateur" condition allows every potential Olympian an opportunity for training and competition without regard to his family financial resources. Under a truly amateur situation, many young people are denied equal chances for Olympic competition.<sup>5</sup>

From the first day the problem emerged, commercialism of athletes has been an anathema to the I.O.C., and its disapproval had lessened little by 1970. Probably skiing has been the worst offender because of the extensive opportunity for skiers to endorse products. Of all the sports in the Olympic program, skiing is the one which most closely combines recreational popularity with expensive equipment. The I.O.C. distaste for Olympic athletes advertising goods and products has been based on the fact that the athlete was accruing material profit from his sport fame. Defenders of the endorsement practice refer to the high costs faced by each competitor, of equipment and travel to remote ski centres. Few athletes can train for skiing at home and, therefore, it is impossible to hold a job while preparing for competition. This argument has carried no influence with the I.O.C., which has occasionally disqualified skiers on the basis of commercialism.

Any discussion of the I.O.C.'s pursuit of amateurism must include recognition of the atmosphere of the times when the Olympic Games were re-established. The I.O.C.'s attitudes toward amateurism were reflections of the beliefs of most sport administrators at the





time--a period when the "gentleman" was an amateur and workers were considered ineligible due to the advantage they gained from their physical labour. No recognition was made of the benefits accruing from the extensive practice time available to the non-working gentleman, nor to the many persons caught in the middle--employees or small business proprietors who did no physical labour but neither did they have much leisure time for practicing sport. The rapidly changing economic situation, the social levelling created by World War I, and the ever-increasing leisure time, all encouraged more of the lower socio-economic classes to participate in sport.

As the gentleman versus labourer criterion for amateur status became obsolete it was replaced with a money yardstick which produced a slightly different basis for discrimination, but discrimination nevertheless. That standard has been the focus of equal censure, with many critics recommending a time basis for judgements as to amateur qualification. Such a measure is no less discriminatory, since the man who, by personal advantage or government support, has no need to work will have sufficient time for training while workers will not. In practice, it is no easier to evaluate the amount of time spent on sport than it is to assess financial gain. Experience has shown that each nation will find a way of interpreting the rules according to its own desires.

Another significant change put the professional-amateur status in doubt when the age-old work-play dichotomy gradually broke down. In earlier times, play-like activities could not be one's work--work seemed relegated to being classed as a chore for most people. Play was



to be reserved as a true re-creative function to prepare oneself for the onerous working time to follow. A professional athlete, therefore, was not "working" and consequently was breaking down the traditional conventions. The influence this state of affairs could have on the young was potentially disastrous. Youth could develop the idea that they could "play" their way through life. There can be no doubt that the I.O.C. members held this view of life's customs. Admittedly, they had some frightening models of professional athletes who, at the close of their athletic careers, had no other occupation to turn to and became useless members of society. Because of the traditional positions, plus the fear of wasted lives, the I.O.C. waged a long and strong battle against all forms of professionalism touching Olympism. Considered in this light, the I.O.C.'s devotion to pure amateurism may be understandable, even if anachronistic in later years.

#### Physical and Character (Moral) Development

The I.O.C.'s lack of emphasis on physical development of the athlete is peculiar. This factor would seem to be the strongest and most readily proven element of the argument for the spread of sport. By 1912, the casual athlete had virtually disappeared from the Olympic Games and the competitors were trained and physically well developed. Surprisingly, Olympic publicity did not appear to emphasize the health aspect of sport participation, despite ready access to perfect examples at all Olympic Games. Coubertin spoke often of the lifetime value of a healthy and trained body, but, even in its discussions, the I.O.C. rarely stressed this factor of its aim.



Parallel with this neglect was the similar treatment of the idea of moral growth through sport participation. Considering the view of modern sport psychologists on this topic, it may be wise that the I.O.C. slighted the subject. Notwithstanding Coubertin's insistence that sound moral attitudes were achievable through sport experiences, it is striking that the I.O.C. put little effort into structured propaganda, and only occasionally reminded its subordinate groups of this aspect of Olympism. The reason might have been due to general public acceptance, in the Western world, of the British concept of games as a builder of good character, and the universal belief in the transfer of such qualities from one set of circumstances to others. The I.O.C. could have assumed that such common knowledge needed no reinforcement. The denial of these assumptions by modern psychologists now leaves Olympism with a scientifically weak element.

### Internationalism

The idea of attaining international peace and understanding through sport competition has been the target of much derision by Olympic critics. In latter years, this topic has received more sarcastic criticism than any other issue affecting the Olympic Games. Sports writers from many nations have discussed this theory with biting cynicism. In the face of all its detractors, the I.O.C. has perpetually reiterated its collective belief in sport's ability to break down international barriers. If it is possible to analyse objectively the actions of the I.O.C. to promote international good will, then many individual members must be criticized for the positions they have taken.



A survey of the I.O.C. Minutes has revealed many situations where speakers were obviously advancing the political belief of their countries, often to the detriment of the Olympic Movement. A case in point was the issue of the dual countries following World War II, which exposed a relatively distinct division of I.O.C. members' opinions according to the political ideology of their nations. In addition, the failure of all motions to remove the flags and anthems from all or some of the Olympic ceremonies suggests that even the I.O.C. members had difficulty in their leadership role of modifying national chauvinism as a road to international understanding. This impasse could well have been caused by the influx of I.O.C. members from "emerging nations" in the 1950's and 1960's. Umminger expressed the needs of these countries very clearly:

Who can blame newly independent states of Africa and Asia for feeling that an Olympic winner is one of the tokens of nationhood, so to speak, like a flag, a seat at the U.N. and a national airline?<sup>6</sup>

However, it must be conceded that elimination of the flags and anthems would not significantly reduce the nationalistic emphasis or conflicts surrounding the Olympic Games without the full agreement and cooperation of all news media, a utopian event not likely to be achieved. Nevertheless, more credence would be placed in the I.O.C. hopes for international appreciation as a result of the Olympic festival if it supported nationalistic de-emphasis in areas where it does have full control.

Political problems confronting the I.O.C. have been numerous, particularly in view of its protestations against any political role.





Although many issues have not been of the I.O.C.'s own making, lack of forceful action in minor political conflicts may have set the stage for major difficulties. Very occasionally the I.O.C. has repealed its recognition of an N.O.C. due to strong evidence of government influence on the national committee. Unfortunately, this usually happened only in the case of less important countries. Little publicity attended such actions and it was seldom long before the N.O.C. was reinstated. Prominent nations were never treated similarly despite the common knowledge that all organizations in some countries were under close government control. All this time the I.O.C. was including more statements in the Olympic rules forbidding government interference in N.O.C.s. Surely such irresolution must have encouraged the use of the I.O.C. as a world stage for exposing political issues. If the I.O.C. had pursued a strong policy of implementing its rules prohibiting political manipulation of all allied groups, it may well have avoided many of the unpleasant situations with which it was confronted in the last twenty years.

Concerning the dual countries, the I.O.C. seemed to take an unusually long time to decide that a government was stable, a decision which undoubtedly involved a political judgement, notwithstanding I.O.C. statements in the rules protesting that such judgements were outside its competence. The South African debate was one which the I.O.C. could not possibly win. Whichever way it decided, half the world would be convinced the I.O.C. was acting politically and discriminately. Certainly it seemed unfair that the very athletes who needed a chance to prove their worthiness were the parties most hurt by the decision to



reject South Africa.

One interesting feature of all the political problems was the inflexible position of Avery Brundage on political involvements. Manifestly, he would have preferred to refuse consideration of many of the questions, choosing the status quo over any appearance of the I.O.C. being politically touched.

### Aesthetics and Arts and Letters

The aesthetics and arts and letters aspect of Olympism has experienced little promotion by the I.O.C. Compared to the amateur and internationalism aims of Olympism, the cultural facet would seem to be a feasible project. Coubertin's conviction that a strong relationship could be forged between sport and other cultural activities was not original; after all, the Greeks apparently had achieved such a union in ancient times. The effort to encourage sport in art through the competitions held at Olympic Games from 1912 to 1948 was considered by the I.O.C. to be a failure, primarily because of the lack of submissions by renowned artists, the problems which arose in the judging arrangements, and the fact that the artists were professionals and not amateurs.

After 1948 only exhibitions were permitted, but the I.O.C. required that all organizing committees arrange such presentations. With the possible exceptions of Rome in 1960 and Mexico City in 1968, most of them created little interest. Unquestionably, the I.O.C. was concerned with problems more immediate to the existence of the Olympic Games, but it is noteworthy that few members paid more than token



interest in Coubertin's vision. As European sensibilities in this area appear to be better developed than those of North America, it is possible that the I.O.C. felt no intense need for such education.

## CONCLUSIONS

### The Audience

In attempting to convince the world of the worth of Olympism, the I.O.C. had set itself an overwhelming responsibility. The traditions and mores of the world's peoples vary too greatly for any single ideology to be understandable, much less acceptable to all. Political, religious, economic, and social differences almost automatically rule out universal agreement on any subject. The unique needs of new countries as opposed to old; poor countries as opposed to wealthy; industrial as opposed to agrarian; and totalitarian as opposed to democratic, pose insurmountable difficulties. In this light, the I.O.C. may well deserve congratulations that the Olympic Games have survived so long. No other international institution has matched its record for longevity. Whatever the reasons, Olympism in its totality is not widely known, much less understood, and world sporting unity in Olympism is still a dream.

### The Content

Olympism can never be widely accepted while its content remains obscure. The word is ignored if its full meaning is nebulous, but the I.O.C. has failed to present a clear definition. The factors of Olympism, as identified in this study, ignored some items that Coubertin



has spoken of, and emphasized others, and one may feel this "selection" to be erroneous. Needless to say, in the absence of a specific definition to guide an examination of I.O.C. actions, an interpretation had to be generated. Certainly no explanations of Olympism can neglect the four factors encompassed in this definition, although other aspects might well be included.

Because the I.O.C. seemingly made no concerted effort to apprise the world of the meaning of Olympism, the concept is almost unknown. Ask athletes, coaches, physical education teachers, parents, or spectators to explain Olympism and the common response is incomprehension. Some might connect good sportsmanship with the Olympic Ideal and others would translate the same words into international good will. Because the facets of Olympism have never been explained as being interdependent, no one aspect makes sense to the majority of Olympic critics. Even in this age, amateurism might be understood as an ideal if its connection with character development were to be stressed. Internationalism makes more sense when linked to moral growth. The consolidation of the totality of Olympism and its dissemination to the world's youth should have occurred in the early years of the I.O.C.'s life, when the ideas incorporated in the philosophy more nearly matched the atmosphere of the times. It is easier to encourage traditional attitudes than to teach new ones.

#### The Method

The N.O.C.s were charged with "the promotion and encouragement of the physical, moral and cultural education of the youth of the





nation, for the development of character, good health and good citizenship."<sup>7</sup> The I.O.C. delegated this responsibility because each N.O.C. could best decide how to approach the task relative to the unique situations in its own country. Unfortunately, the I.O.C. never requested proof that the N.O.C. was doing the job. Evidently, N.O.C.s thought their responsibilities ended when they gathered teams and sent them to the Olympic Games, and apparently the I.O.C. was willing to accept such a discharge of duties. Occasionally the I.O.C. reminded N.O.C.s of their obligations for the amateur purity of their athletes, but few promptings were made on behalf of the educational facet of their functions.

As a result, Olympism was rarely heard of in conjunction with sport. The Olympic Games represented only the zenith of competition, not the celebration of an ideal. Several times the U.S.S.R. members of the I.O.C. presented briefs to the General Assembly, calling attention to the need for direct intervention of the I.O.C. to increase knowledge and understanding of Olympism among Olympic supporters, but to no avail.

This is where the I.O.C. failed. There is no purpose to the word "Olympic" being attached to this international sports meet unless it means more than competition, as its founder intended. Without such a connotation, the Olympics are superfluous, since world championship meets in each sport are of equal or greater merit, and the expense of holding them is far less.

The inability of the I.O.C. to diffuse Olympism is surprising. Requiring the N.O.C.s to fulfil their role would seem to be a relatively



easy task, always supposing the I.O.C. was prepared to apply disciplinary action. Of course, in other areas (political influence and amateurism) the I.O.C. very rarely took such action against recalcitrant N.O.C.s or athletes, but if the I.O.C. really considered the educative role of the N.O.C.'s to be important, it should have been ready to exercise its supervisory powers.

### The Leadership

As mentioned earlier, the exclusiveness of the I.O.C. cannot be viewed as a weakness relative to carrying out its functions. The fact that the I.O.C. has failed to enforce its own rules on amateurism, political influence, and the obligations of the N.O.C.s, cannot be attributed to the self-recruiting element of I.O.C. membership, although possibly the I.O.C. was afraid of creating a rupture in Olympic organizations that could damage the growth and progress of the Games, particularly if any of the major nations was concerned. This lack of action would suggest to nations and individuals that the I.O.C. lacked the courage of its own convictions. Certainly, the I.O.C. seems less able today to insist on conformance to its wishes, and more and more often appears to capitulate to external pressures.

The hierarchy established by the I.O.C., even though necessary, has isolated its members from direct knowledge of the attitudes of the athletes and spectators. Also, the position of each member in society has a similar effect. Although many of the members are ex-athletes themselves, by the time they are elected to I.O.C. membership, competitive needs and circumstances have changed so that their personal



experiences could well hamper true understanding of contemporary problems.

Through the failure of the I.O.C. to give strong and active support to a World Olympic Day and to the International Olympic Academy, golden opportunities for education were lost. Recommendations that N.O.C.s support these institutions were not enough, as few N.O.C.s have grasped the opportunities. A similar situation has prevailed in relation to the "Regional Games," although it must be admitted that education through that medium would not be as easy to achieve.

The greatest advancement in the Olympic Movement has been in the areas involving technical details of the Games operation, and these are under the control of the I.F.s. All elements of these arrangements, while not always perfect, have improved in quality and efficiency, including judging, timing, and equipment. By contrast, other aspects of the Games--the rules and policies--have become more complicated and ambiguous. The philosophy of Olympism, which could and might have given the Olympic Games a special atmosphere, is no better known today than it was at the outset of their modern revival. The fame and prestige of the Olympic Games has been based on a unique organization of many sports, drawing athletes from all countries, not on the philosophy of sport which those Games were intended to celebrate.

The Olympic Movement deserves to be more fully researched than has occurred to date. One may hope that the increasing interest in sport history investigative studies will result in a closer and



deeper examination of the Olympic phenomenon and all its ramifications. The potential for research is rich, including philosophical, social, political and economic historical studies of sports, national involvement, individual Games, the supportive organizations, and the purposes and attitudes of the athletes.





## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 14

<sup>1</sup>International Olympic Committee, "Minutes of the General Assembly: Stockholm, 1912" (Lausanne: The Committee, 1912), July 8.

<sup>2</sup>Walter Umminger, *Supermen, Heroes and Gods* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>This situation has been greatly relieved by the new eligibility rules instituted in 1974.

<sup>6</sup>Umminger, p. 35.

<sup>7</sup>I.O.C., *Olympic Rules and Regulations* (Lausanne: The Committee, 1967), p. 18.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## 1. BOOKS

Bellmer, Karl, ed. *Man in Sport*. Munich: Max Hueber, 1972.

Bolanaki, Angelo. *Historique du Sport en Egypte, le State D'Alexandrie, La Renaissance de L'Olympisme, 1894-1954*. n.p.: n.n., n.d., facing p. 6. [39-page booklet, possibly published by author in Egypt, in 1954.]

British Olympic Council. *The Fourth Olympiad: London, 1908, Official Report*, ed. Theodore Andrea Cook. London: British Olympic Association, 1908.

Coubertin, Pierre de. *Une Campagne de Vingt et Un Ans*. Paris: Librairie de L'Education Physique, 1908.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Mémoires Olympiques*. Aix-en-Provence: Paul Roubaud, 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, rev. ed., eds. L. Diem and O. Andersen; translated from the French by J. G. Dixon. Lausanne: Carl-Diem-Institut, Editions Internationales Olympia, 1966.

Cozens, Frederick W., and Florence Scovil Stumpf. *Sports in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Czechoslovak Organising Committee. *Minutes of the Technical Olympic Congress, Prague, May 29-June 4, 1925*. Prague: Czechoslovak Olympic Committee, State Printing Office, 1925.

Drees, Ludwig. *Olympia: Gods, Artists and Athletes*. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Eyquem, Marie Thérèse. *Pierre de Coubertin: L'Epopée Olympique*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1966.

Gardiner, E. Norman. *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. London: Macmillan, 1910.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Athletics of the Ancient World*. 1930; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Goodhart, Philip, and Christopher Chataway. *War Without Weapons*. London: W. H. Allen, 1968.

Graham, Peter, ed. *The Olympic Games*. Cornwall, N.Y.: Leisure Press, in press, 1976.



- Harris, H. A. *Greek Athletes and Athletics*. London: Hutchinson, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sport in Greece and Rome*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1972.
- Henry, Bill. *An Approved History of the Olympic Games*. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1948.
- Howell, Nancy, and Maxwell L. Howell. *Sports and Games in Canadian Life: 1700 to the Present*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1969.
- Hughes, Thomas. *Tom Brown's School Days*. London: Dent, 1951.
- Hymnary of the United Church of Canada, The*. Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1930.
- International Olympic Academy. *The International Olympic Academy: Fourth Session, Aug. 1964, Olympia, Greece*. Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The International Olympic Academy: Ninth Session, Aug-Sept, 1969, Olympia Greece*. Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and George of Hanover, eds. *Olympia: And the International Olympic Academy*. Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, n.d., [ca. 1972].
- International Olympic Committee. *Olympic Rules and Regulations*. Lausanne: The Committee, 1908; 1920; 1921; 1923; 1939; 1949; 1955; 1956; 1958; 1962; 1966; 1967; 1971; 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Minutes of the Lausanne Congress 1921*. Lausanne: The Committee, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Minutes of the Olympic Congress of Berlin 1930: IIIrd Year of the IXth Olympiad, May 25-30*. Lausanne: The Committee, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Olympic Directory*. Lausanne: The Committee, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Olympism*, ed. Monique Berlioux. Lausanne: The Committee, 1972.
- Johnson, William O. *All that Glitters is not Gold*. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1972.
- Killanin, Lord, and John Rodda, eds. *The Olympic Games: 80 Years of People, Events and Records*. Don Mills, Ont.: Collier-Macmillan, Canada, 1976.
- Lekarska, Nadejda. *Essays and Studies on Olympic Problems*. Sofia: Medicina i Fizkultura, State Publishing House, 1973.





- Mandell, Richard D. *The Nazi Olympics*. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- Mayer, Otto. *A Travers les Anneaux Olympiques*. Geneva: Pierre Cailler, 1960.
- McIntosh, Peter C., ed. *Physical Education Since 1800*. London: Bell and Sons, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. *Landmarks in the History of Physical Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957.
- Messinesi, Leon. *A Branch of Wild Olive*. New York: Exposition, 1973.
- Natan, Alex, ed. *Sport and Society: A Symposium*. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1958.
- Orwell, George. *Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960.
- Park, Robert Ezra. *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950.
- Redmond, Gerald. *The Caledonian Games in Nineteenth Century America*. Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, 1971.
- Robinson, Rachel Sargent. *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics*. 1927; rpt. Cincinnati, Ohio: R. S. Robinson, 1955.
- Schapp, Dick. *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*. 3d ed. New York: Ballantine Books, 1976.
- Umminger, Walter. *Supermen, Heroes and Gods*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

## 2. PERIODICALS

- Baillet-Latour, Henri de. "The rights and duties of the International Olympic Committee, the National Olympic Committees and the International Federations." *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 15.
- Breal, Michael. "Speech at the closing banquet [The Congress of Paris], June 23, 1894." *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 3, col. 3.
- Brundage, Avery. "Why the Olympic Games?" *Report of the United States Olympic Committee*, 1948. New York: United States Olympic Committee, 1948, p. 21.



Connolly, James B. "The Spirit of the Olympian Games." *The Outing Magazine*, 36 (July, 1900[?]), 103.

Coubertin, Pierre de. "Speech at the closing banquet [The Congress of Paris], June 23, 1894." *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), p. 3, col. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Circular Letter addressed to the Members of the I.O.C., Lausanne, December, 1920." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 41 (August, 1953), 21.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Arts, Letters and Sport." *Cultures*, 1(2), UNESCO and la Baconnière (1973), 163-164.

[I.O.C.] *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 1 (July, 1894), 1-4.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Bulletin of the International Committee for the Olympic Games*, 2 (July, 1894), p. 4, col. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Olympic Competitions in Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture for 1908." *Revue Olympique*, 22 (October, 1907), 343.

International Olympic Committee. "Decisions Taken by the Technical Congress at Prague." *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 1 (January, 1926), 15-16.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Administration" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Definition of an Amateur," and "Necessary conditions for representing a country" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 19.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Fundamental Principles" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 16.

\_\_\_\_\_. "National Committees" [*Olympic Rules and Regulations*], as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Ninth Far Eastern Games." *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 17 (March, 1931), 14.

[I.O.C.] "The Olympic Flag." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 87 (August, 1964), 45-46.



- [I.O.C.] Editorial. "To the subscribers and readers of the 'Bulletin.'" *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 98-99 (May-August, 1967), 57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mexico Without the South Africans." *I.O.C. Newsletter*, 8 (May, 1968), 147-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Citius, Altius, Fortius." *Olympic Review*, 28 (January, 1970), 9.
- Ketseas, Jean. "Letter to the Editor." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 78 (May, 1962), 70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Olympic Torch and its Origin." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 87 (August, 1964), 44-45.
- Leiper, Jean M. "International Olympic Association [Committee, sic]." *Journal of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 22(4) (March-April, 1976), 12.
- Messerli, F. M. "Olympism." Extract from a speech cited in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 81 (February, 1963), 60.
- Ortensi, Dagoberto. "The Olympic Villages and the Gigantism of the Games." *Olympic Review*, 56-57 (May-June, 1972), 272-278.
- Poplimont, Andre G. "Berlin 1936." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 55 (October, 1956), 46-47.
- Ritter von Halt, Karl. "Letter to the Editor." *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 51 (August, 1955), 35.
- Shapen, Robert. "Profiles: Amateur." *The New Yorker*, 36 (July 25, 1960), 30-66.
- Shaw, Albert. "Baron Pierre de Coubertin." *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, 17 (April, 1898), 436.
- Sloane, William Milligan. "The Olympic Idea." *The Century Magazine*, 84 (July, 1912), 409.
- Waldstein, Charles. "The Olympian Games at Athens." *Harper's Weekly*, 20 (May 16, 1896), 493.



### 3. MINUTES

#### Primary sources (unpublished)

The following references, taken from various I.O.C. documents, are all assumed to be compiled by the I.O.C. at Lausanne, Switzerland, and are listed here in chronological order, showing meeting sites, but omitting page references (which can be found in the footnotes at the end of each chapter).

Olympic Games Commission. "Minutes of the Olympic Games Commission [Congress of Paris] June 19, 21, 1894." Lausanne: The Commission, 1894.

International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Budapest, 1911."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Stockholm, 1912."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1919."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Antwerp, 1920."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1921."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Paris, 1922."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1923."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Paris, 1924."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Prague, 1925."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lisbon, 1926."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Monaco, 1927."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1929."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Vienna, 1933."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Athens, 1934."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Oslo, 1935."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Berlin, 1936."





International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly:  
Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 1936."

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Warsaw, 1937."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Cairo, 1938."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1946."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Stockholm, 1947."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: London, 1948."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: St. Moritz, 1948."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1949."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Copenhagen, 1950."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Vienna, 1951."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Helsinki, 1952."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Oslo, 1952."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Mexico City, 1953."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Athens, 1954."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Barcelona, 1955."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Paris, 1955."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Melbourne, 1956."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Sofia, 1957."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Munich, 1959."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: San Francisco, 1960."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Madrid, 1965."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1966."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Tehran, 1967."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Grenoble, 1968."
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Mexico City, 1968."



International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Warsaw, 1969."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Press Release." I.O.C. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Warsaw, 1969."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Proposals Concerning the Alteration of the Official Interpretation of Eligibility Rule No. 26." I.O.C. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Warsaw, 1969."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Suggestions Concerning the Interpretation of Rule No. 26 of Eligibility." I.O.C. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Warsaw, 1969."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Amsterdam, 1970."

\_\_\_\_\_. "Report of Standing Commission on Eligibility." I.O.C. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Amsterdam, 1970."

#### Secondary sources (published)

The following references, taken from various I.O.C. publications (for example, the *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*), are all assumed to be published by the I.O.C. at Lausanne, Switzerland, and are listed here in chronological order, showing meeting site as well as publication page numbers.

International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Paris, 1901," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, n.v. (July, 1901), 34.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: The Hague, 1907," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 18 (June, 1907), 278.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Berlin, 1909," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 42 (June, 1909), 90-91.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Luxembourg, 1910," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 54 (June, 1910), 85.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Budapest, 1911," as reported in *Revue Olympique*, 66 (June, 1911), 90-91.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of Meeting of Presidents of N.O.C.s with the Executive Committee of the I.O.C.," Amsterdam, 1928; as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 11 (October, 1928), 15-20.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1929," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 13 (July, 1929), 4-9.



International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Berlin, 1930," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 16 (June, 1930), 18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee and of the Council of Delegates of the I.F.s, Paris, 1930," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 17 (March, 1931), 13.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Barcelona, 1931," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 18 (July, 1931), 13.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the I.O.C. and of the Council of Delegates of the I.F.s, Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 2-4.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Vienna, 1933," as reported in *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 24 (June, 1933), 7-13.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Lausanne, 1946," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 1 (October, 1946), 16-17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Copenhagen, 1950," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 21-22 (June-August, 1950), 14-23.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Vienna, 1951," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 27 (June, 1951), 12-13.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Oslo, 1952," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 32 (March, 1952), 11.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee of the I.O.C. with Delegates of the I.F.s, Helsinki, 1952," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 34-35 (July-September, 1952), 32.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Extract of the Minutes of the Conference of the Executive Committee of the I.O.C. with the delegates of the N.O.C.s," Mexico City, 1953, as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 39-40 (June, 1953), 41.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Athens, 1954," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 46 (July, 1954), 52-53.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Conference of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Delegates of the I.F.s, Paris, 1955," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 52 (November, 1955), 38.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Cortina D'Ampezzo, 1956," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 54 (May, 1956), 29-47.



- International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Melbourne, 1956," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 58 (May, 1957), 46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with Delegates of the N.O.C.s and I.F.s: Evian, 1957," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 61 (February, 1958), 65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Sofia, 1957," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 61 (February, 1958), 76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Tokyo, 1958," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 63 (August, 1958), 40-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Delegates of the N.O.C.s, Rome, May 19, 1959," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 67 (August, 1959), 66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: San Francisco, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 70 (May, 1960), 47-52, App. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1960," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 72 (November, 1960), 62-67, App. 2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Athens, 1961," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 75 (August, 1961), 74-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Moscow, 1962," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 80 (November, 1962), 47-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 70-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the Representatives of the N.O.C.s, Baden-Baden, 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 76-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes [of] Meeting of the Executive Board of the I.O.C. with the representatives of the N.O.C.s, Kurhaus-Baden-Baden (Germany) October 15th 1963," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 85 (February, 1964), 75-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Innsbruck, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 86 (May, 1964), 65-69, App. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Tokyo, 1964," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 89 (February, 1965), 72-77, App. 3.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Madrid, 1965," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 92 (November, 1965), 74-77, App. 2.





International Olympic Committee. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Rome, 1966," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 95 (August, 1966), 9-90, App. 7.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Minutes of the General Assembly: Tehran, 1967," as reported in *Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 98-99 (May-August, 1967), 93.

#### 4. UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

Lindsay, Peter Leslie. "A History of Sport in Canada, 1807-1867." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1969.

Lucas, John Apostol. "Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Years of the Modern International Olympic Movement, 1883-1896." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962.

Mutimer, Brian T. P. "Arnold and Organised Games in the English Public Schools of the Nineteenth Century." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1971.



## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES



## INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

<u>Session No.</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Place</u>
1	1894	Paris, France (Congress of Paris)
2	1896	Athens, Greece
3	1897	Le Havre, France
4	1901	Paris, France
5	1903	Paris, France
6	1904	London, England
7	1905	Brussels, Belgium
8	1906	Athens, Greece
9	1907	The Hague, Holland
	1908	London, England (Meeting not counted in sequence, but Minutes exist; correction made in 1971)
10	1909	Berlin, Germany
11	1910	Luxumburg, Luxumburg
12	1911	Budapest, Hungary
13	1912	Basel, Switzerland (Apparently a meeting to plan a Congress; not a full General Assembly)
14	1912	Stockholm, Sweden
15	1913	Lausanne, Switzerland
16	1914	Paris, France
No meetings because of World War I		
17	1919	Lausanne, Switzerland
18	1920	Antwerp, Belgium
19	1921	Lausanne, Switzerland
20	1922	Paris, France
21	1923	Rome, Italy
22	1924	Paris, France
23	1925	Prague, Czechoslovakia
24	1926	Lisbon, Portugal
25	1927	Monaco (Location not named)





<u>Session No.</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Place</u>
26	1928	Amsterdam, Holland
27	1929	Lausanne, Switzerland
28	1930	Berlin, Germany
29	1931	Barcelona, Spain
30	1932	Los Angeles, U.S.A.
31	1933	Vienna, Austria
32	1934	Athens, Greece
33	1935	Oslo, Norway
34	1936	Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany
35	1936	Berlin, Germany (The first year that meetings were held at the time of each Games)
36	1937	Warsaw, Poland
37	1938	Cairo, Egypt
38	1939	London, England
No meetings because of World War II		
39	1946	Lausanne, Switzerland
40	1947	Stockholm, Sweden
41	1948	St. Moritz, Switzerland
42	1948	London, England
43	1949	Rome, Italy
44	1950	Copenhagen, Denmark
45	1951	Vienna, Austria
46	1952	Oslo, Norway
47	1952	Helsinki, Finland
48	1953	Mexico City, Mexico
49	1954	Athens, Greece
50	1955	Paris, France
51	1956	Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy
52	1956	Melbourne, Australia
53	1957	Sofia, Bulgaria
54	1958	Tokyo, Japan
55	1959	Munich, Germany



<u>Session No.</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Place</u>
56	1960	San Francisco, U.S.A.
57	1960	Rome, Italy
58	1961	Athens, Greece
59	1962	Moscow, U.S.S.R.
60	1963	Baden-Baden, Germany
61	1964	Innsbruck, Austria
62	1964	Tokyo, Japan
63	1965	Madrid, Spain
64	1966	Rome, Italy
65	1967	Tehran, Iran
66	1968	Grenoble, France
67	1968	Mexico City, Mexico
68	1969	Warsaw, Poland
69	1970	Amsterdam, Holland



## APPENDIX B

DATES OF OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS AND THE AMATEUR RULES  
FROM OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS



DATES OF OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS AND THE AMATEUR RULES  
FROM OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS

1894 Congress of Paris Recommendations

The following are the recommendations (from the Congress of Paris) regarding amateur qualification. The statements never became part of the I.O.C. rules.

I. Considered as an amateur in athletics will be:

All persons who have never taken part in a competition open to all comers, nor competed for a prize in kind or for a sum of money of whatever source it comes, notably from gate receipts, or with professionals, and who has never been, at any period of his life, paid as a professor or coach of physical exercises.

Very exceptionally, the Unions or Federations of Societies may authorize a meet between amateurs and professionals, as long as the prizes offered are not cash.

All infractions of the amateur rules will result in disqualification.

II. Anyone who has been disqualified can be reinstated when the Union, Federation or Society to which he belongs decides that the disqualification has been a case of error or ignorance.

III. That the one who procures money by means of the prizes he has won loses his amateur status.

That the value of art objects not necessarily be limited but that this value not reach, in general, a very high amount.

IV. That gate money can be shared as compensation for travel between participating societies but never between the competitors themselves; that no competitor may be allowed to travel only by means of the indemnity offered by another Society if this is not agreed to by his own Society.

That, in any case, the funds may not be given directly to the competitor, but remitted to the Society to which he belongs.

V. That, betting being incompatible with amateurism, the societies must prevent or restrain it by all the means in their power and specially by opposing its official organization at the location of the competitions.

VI. That the tendency of all sports, without exception, being toward pure amateurism, no permanent grounds exist in any sport to legitimize cash prizes, but concerning competitions of equestrian, shooting and yachting, the general definition of amateur temporarily not be applied.





VII. That no one may be an amateur in one sport and a professional in another.

Olympic Rules and Regulations appeared in the following years and the amateur rules are explained or reproduced, if they existed, for each year.

1908 No rule  
1911 No rule  
1920 No rule  
1921 No rule

1924 Statement that the definition of amateur would be established by each I.F. and if no I.F. existed for a sport the definition would be set by the organizing committee for the Olympic Games.  
1927 No rule book appeared to exist but the rules were published in the *Official Bulletin of the I.O.C.*, 5 (January, 1927), 19.

#### I. Definition of an Amateur

The definition of an amateur as drawn up by the International Federations of Sport is recognised for athletes taking part in the Olympic Games.

In a case where there is no International Federation governing a sport the definition shall be drawn up by the Organising Committee. The National Association, which in each country governs each particular sport, must certify that each competitor is an amateur in accordance with the rules of the International Federation governing that sport.

This declaration must also be signed by the National Olympic Committee of that country. This committee must also declare that it considers the competitor an amateur according to the definition of the International Federation in question.

#### II. Necessary conditions for representing a country

\* \* \*

Athletes taking part in the Olympic Games must satisfy the obligations hereafter.

1. Must not be or knowingly have become a professional in the Sport for which he is entered or in any other sport.

2. Must not have received re-imbusement or compensation for loss of salary.



Finally each athlete must sign the following declaration on his honour:

"I, the undersigned, declare on my honour that I am an Amateur according to the Olympic Rules of Amateurism."

1939 No rule book appeared to exist but the rules are available in printed format, and are possibly taken from the official I.O.C. organ produced during World War II by Carl Diem in Berlin.

#### 1. Definition of an Amateur

The definition of an amateur as drawn up by the respective International Federation of Sport is recognised for the admission of athletes taking part in the Olympic Games.

Where there is no International Federation governing a sport, the definition shall be drawn up by the Organizing Committee, in agreement with the I.O.C. The National Association, which in each country governs each particular sport, must certify on the special form that each competitor is an amateur in accordance with the rules of the International Federation governing that sport.

This declaration must also be countersigned by the National Olympic Committee of that country. This committee must also declare that it considers the competitor an amateur according to the definition of the International Federation in question.

#### 2. Necessary Conditions for Representing a Country

An athlete taking part in the Olympic Games must satisfy the following conditions.

(1) Must not be, or knowingly have become, a professional in the sport for which he is entered or in any other sport.

(2) Must not have received re-imbursement or compensation for loss of salary. Article 2 does not apply: when holidays are taken under normal professional conditions, or when they are granted under the same conditions on the occasion of the Olympic Games, provided that they do not constitute a camouflaged re-imbursement--direct or indirect--of the salary lost; and when after personal investigation and as a very exceptional permission a payment is made directly to the employer of compensation for the wife, the mother or the father of the athlete during his absence if he is the sole support of his family.

(3) Must not be a teacher receiving remuneration for instruction in physical education or sport. Excepted from this rule are those whose normal duties as teachers include elementary instruction in physical education or sport provided that this is not their principal occupation.



Finally each athlete must sign the following declaration on his honour:

"I, the undersigned, declare on my honour that I am an Amateur according to the Olympic Rules of Amateurism and that I fulfil the conditions required by the Olympic Rules."

1949

#### Definition of an Amateur

38. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport solely for pleasure and for the physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom participation in sport is nothing more than recreation without material gain of any kind direct or indirect and in accordance with the rules of the International Federation concerned.

1955

#### Definition of an Amateur

37. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport solely for pleasure and for the physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom participation in sport is nothing more than recreation without material gain of any kind, direct or indirect, and in accordance with the rules of the International Federation concerned.

1956

#### Definition of an Amateur

26. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport solely for pleasure and for the physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom participation in sport is nothing more than recreation without material gain of any kind, direct or indirect. Furthermore, he must comply with the rules of the International Federation concerned.

1958

#### Definition of an Amateur

26. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport solely for pleasure and for the physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom participation in sport is nothing more than recreation without material gain of any kind, direct or indirect. In addition, he must comply with the rules of the International Federation concerned. (See pages 75, 95, 96 and 97.)

#### Pseudo Amateurs [p. 75]

Individuals subsidized by governments, educational institutions, or business concerns because of their athletic ability are not amateurs. Business or industrial concerns sometimes employ athletes or sponsor athletic teams for their advertising value. The athletes are given paid employment with little work to do and are free to practice and compete at all times. For national aggrandizement, governments occasionally adopt the same methods and give athletes positions in the Army, on the



police force or in a government office. They also operate training camps for extended periods. Some colleges and universities offer outstanding athletes scholarships and inducements of various kinds. Recipients of these special favours which are granted only because of athletic ability are not amateurs. (See amateur definition, Rule 26 and pages 95, 96 and 97.)

Decisions of the International Olympic Committee [pp. 95-97]

1. *The nationalization of sports for political purposes*

The International Olympic Committee notes with great satisfaction that its efforts are universally approved, it rejoices in the enthusiasm which the Olympic Movement has encouraged among the different nations and it congratulates the nations which, with a view of encouraging popular sports have adopted vast programs of physical education.

It considers, however, as dangerous to the Olympic ideals, that, besides the proper development of sports in accordance with the principles of amateurism, certain tendencies exist which aim primarily at a national exaltation of the results gained instead of the realization that the sharing of friendly effort and rivalry is the essential aim of the Olympic Games.

2. *Training-camps*

The practice of interrupting the occupation of an athlete (studies or employment) to put him in a camp for athletes for over two weeks for special training is not in accord with the ideals of the Olympic Games.

3. *Professionals*

A professional in one sport is considered a professional in all other sports. In the opinion of the International Olympic Committee, this rule should have general observance.

4. *Doping of athletes*

The use of drugs or artificial stimulants of any kind is condemned and any person offering or accepting dope, in any form whatsoever, cannot compete in the Olympic Games.

5. National Olympic Committees are reminded that, while the Olympic Games welcome the Youth of the World, it is a physical impossibility to accommodate *all* that Youth, and are asked to use discretion and send to the Games only competitors of Olympic caliber.

6. The following are not eligible for Olympic competitions:

- a) Those who have participated for money, for merchandise prizes easily converted into money, or, without permission of the National Federation within the rules of the International Federation concerned, for prizes exceeding 40 Dollars in value, and those who have





received because of their sport performances, valuable presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.

- b) Those who have been paid for training or coaching others for organized sport competitions.
  - c) Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducements of any kind to participate. This includes those who have secured employment by reason of their sport performances, rather than their ability, in various branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema or Radio broadcasting.
  - d) Those who have accepted for expenses reimbursement in excess of the actual outlay.
  - e) Those who have decided to become professional athletes and are participating to enhance their commercial value.
  - f) Those who have neglected their usual vocation or employment for competitive sport whether at home or abroad.
7. If a competitor is paid for the use of his name or picture, or for a radio or television appearance, in connection with commercial advertising, it is capitalization of athletic fame as described above. Even if no payment is made, such practices are to be deplored, since in the minds of many, particularly the young, they undermine the exalted position rightly held by amateur competitors.

1962

#### Definition of an Amateur

26. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind.

He cannot avail himself of this qualification:

- a) If he has not a basic occupation designed to insure his present and future livelihood;
- b) If he receives or has received a remuneration for participation in sport;
- c) If he does not comply with the rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this rule number 26 (see pages 75, 95, 96, 97).

#### Pseudo Amateurs [p. 75]

Individuals subsidized by governments, educational institutions, or business concerns because of their athletic ability are not amateurs. Business or industrial concerns sometimes employ athletes or sponsor athletic teams for their advertising value. The athletes are given paid employment with little work to do and are free to practice and compete at all times. For national aggrandizement, governments occasionally adopt the same methods and give athletes positions in the Army,



on the police force or in a government office. They also operate training camps for extended periods. Some colleges and universities offer outstanding athletes scholarships and inducements of various kinds. Recipients of these special favours which are granted only because of athletic ability are not amateurs. (See amateur definition, Rule 26 and pages 95, 96 and 97.)

#### Decisions of the International Olympic Committee [pp. 95-97]

##### 1. *Making capital out of sports for political purposes*

The International Olympic Committee notes with great satisfaction that its efforts are universally approved, it rejoices in the enthusiasm which the Olympic Movement has encouraged among the different nations and it congratulates those which, with a view of encouraging popular sports have adopted vast programs of physical education.

It considers, however, as dangerous to the Olympic ideals, that, besides the proper development of sports in accordance with the principles of amateurism, certain tendencies exist which aim primarily at a national exaltation of the results gained instead of the realization that the sharing of friendly effort and rivalry is the essential aim of the Olympic Games.

##### 2. *Training camps*

The practice of interrupting the occupation of an athlete (studies or employment) to put him in a camp for athletes for over three weeks for special training is not in accord with the ideals of the Olympic Games.

##### 3. *Professionals*

A professional in one sport is considered a professional in all other sports. In the opinion of the International Olympic Committee, this rule should have general observance.

##### 4. *Doping of athletes*

The use of drugs or artificial stimulants of any kind is condemned and any person offering or accepting dope, in any form whatsoever, cannot participate in the Olympic Games.



5. National Olympic Committees are reminded that, while the Olympic Games welcome the Youth of the World, it is a physical impossibility to accommodate *all* that Youth, and are asked to use discretion and send to the Games only competitors of Olympic caliber.

6. Among others the following are not eligible for Olympic competitions:

- a) Those who have participated for money, for having converted prizes into money, or, without permission of the National Federation within the rules of the International Federation concerned, for having accepted prizes exceeding 50 dollars in value, and those who have received because of their sport performances, valuable presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.
- b) Those who have been paid for training or coaching others for organized sport competitions.
- c) Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame or their performances, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducements of any kind to participate. This includes those who have secured employment by reason of their sport performances, rather than their ability, in various branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema or Radio broadcasting.
- d) Those who have accepted for expenses reimbursement in excess of the actual outlay.
- e) Those who have decided to become professional athletes and are participating to enhance their commercial value.
- f) Those who have neglected their usual vocation or employment for competitive sport whether at home or abroad.

7. If a competitor is paid for the use of his name or picture, or for a radio or television appearance, in connection with commercial advertising, it is capitalization of athletic fame as described above. Even if no payment is made, such practices are to be deplored, since in the minds of many, particularly the young, they undermine the exalted position rightly held by amateur champions.

1966

#### Definition of an Amateur

26. An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind.

He cannot avail himself of this qualification:

- a) If he has not a basic occupation designed to insure his present and future livelihood;
- b) If he receives or has received remuneration for participation in sport;
- c) If he does not comply with the rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this Rule number 26 (see Eligibility Rules).



## RULES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR THE OLYMPIC GAMES

The Olympic Games are restricted to amateurs

The Olympic Games are held every four years. They assemble amateurs of all nations in fair and equal competition.

No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or political affiliations.

Only persons who are amateurs within the definition laid down in art. 26 of these Rules may compete in the Olympic Games.

### Article 26

*An amateur is one who participates and always has participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind. He does not qualify:*

- a) If he has not a basic occupation designed to insure his present and future livelihood;*
- b) If he receives or has received remuneration for participation in sport;*
- c) If he does not comply with the Rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this Rule number 26.*

### Official interpretations

The official interpretations referred to in Rule 26 follow. It is the intention that additional interpretations will be issued from time to time as required. Violations of these regulations will be referred to a special committee appointed by the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee for investigation and report with a view to action.

So far as the Olympic Games are concerned these rules must be complied with, even if they appear to conflict with the rules of any other organization.

*The International Olympic Committee reserves to itself the right to make exceptions to these rules in the case of sports or individuals, provided that the basic principle that an athlete does not make a profit or livelihood out of his sport is not infringed.*

Among others, the following are not eligible for Olympic competition:

Those who have participated for money, or who have converted prizes into money or, without permission of the National Federation within the Rules of the International Federation concerned, have received prizes exceeding 50 Dollars in value, and those who have received presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.





Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame or success, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducements of any kind to participate, or those who have secured employment or promotion by reason of their sport performances rather than their ability, whether in commercial or industrial enterprises, the armed Services or any branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema, Radio, or any other paid activity.

\*

An athlete who becomes a professional in *any* sport or who has decided to become a professional or who plays in a professional team with a view to become a professional. (In the opinion of the International Olympic Committee, this rule should have general observance.)

\*

Those who are paid for teaching or coaching others for competition in sport.

\*

Anyone awarded a scholarship mainly for his athletic ability.

\*

An athlete who demands payment or expense money for a manager, coach, relative or friend.

\*

Those who have received payment of expenses in excess of the actual outlay.

\*

Those whose occupation (studies or employment) has been interrupted for special training in a camp for more than four weeks in any twelve month period.

\*

Those who have received expense money for more than 28 days, exclusive of the time taken in travelling, in any one calendar year. Extensions may be given under exceptional circumstances by their international federation to cover competitions against another country, or in the Olympic or Regional Games.

\*

Those who have neglected their usual vocation or employment for competitive sport whether at home or abroad.

\*

Any employment must be bona fide and not a cover for excessive opportunities for training or competition in sport.

\*



If an athlete is paid for the use of his name or picture or for a radio or television appearance, it is capitalization of athletic fame as described above. (Even if no payment is made, such practices are to be deplored, since in the minds of many, particularly the young, they undermine the exalted position rightly held by amateur champions.)

#### A competitor is permitted to receive

Travelling and living expenses corresponding to the actual outlay during competition, including the Olympic Games, and for a very limited period of training (no more than four weeks), subject to approval of his National Olympic Committee.

Clothing and equipment as required for practicing his sport from his amateur sport organization.

Pocket money to cover petty daily expenses during the Games but only from his National Olympic Committee.

#### Contribution because of loss of salary

The International Olympic Committee in principle is opposed to payments for broken time which it considers an infraction of Olympic amateurism.

However, when a competitor can prove that his dependants are suffering hardship because of his (or her) loss of salary or wages while attending the Olympic Games, his National Olympic Committee may make a contribution to those dependants, but under no circumstances may it exceed the sum which he (or she) would have earned during his (or her) actual period of absence, which in turn must not exceed 30 days.

#### Other decisions

An athlete paid for teaching elementary sport (beginners or school-children) on a temporary basis without abandoning his usual occupation remains eligible.

An athlete may be a full-time professional journalist, radio or television reporter or a full-time manager of or worker in an athletic facility without forfeiting his amateur status.

#### Pseudo amateurs

Individuals subsidized by governments, educational institutions, or business concerns because of their athletic ability are not amateurs. Business and industrial concerns sometimes employ athletes for their advertising value. The athletes are given paid employment with little work to do and are free to practise and compete at all times. For national aggrandizement, governments occasionally adopt the same methods and give athletes positions in the Army, on the police force or in a government office. They also operate training camps for extended periods. Some colleges and universities offer outstanding athletes



scholarships and inducements of various kinds. Recipients of these special favours which are granted only because of athletic ability are not amateurs.

1971

### Eligibility

26. To be eligible for the Olympic Games a competitor must always have participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind.

He can avail himself of this qualification:

- a) If he has a basic occupation designed to ensure his present and future livelihood;
- b) If he does not receive or has never received any remuneration for participation in sport;
- c) If he complies with the rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this rule (see Eligibility Code).

### ELIGIBILITY CODE

The Olympic Games are held every four years. They assemble amateurs of all nations in fair and equal competition.

No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or political affiliations.

Only persons who fulfil the conditions laid down in art. 26 of these Rules may compete in the Olympic Games.

### Article 26

*To be eligible for the Olympic Games a competitor must always have participated in sport as an avocation without material gain of any kind.*

*He can avail himself of this qualification:*

- a) If he has a basic occupation designed to ensure his present and future livelihood;*
- b) If he does not receive or has never received any remuneration for participation in sport;*
- c) If he complies with the rules of the International Federation concerned, and the official interpretations of this art. 26.*

*A person who complies with these conditions is considered an amateur from the Olympic point of view.*

The official interpretations referred to in art. 26 follow. It is the intention that additional interpretations will be issued from time to time as required. Violations of these regulations will be referred to a special committee appointed by the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee for investigation and report with a view to action.



So far as the Olympic Games are concerned these rules must be complied with, even if they conflict with the rules of any other organization.

*The International Olympic Committee reserves to itself the right to make exceptions to these rules in the case of sports or individuals, provided that the basic principles that an athlete does not make a profit or livelihood out of his sport is not infringed.*

*Among others, the following are not eligible for Olympic competition:*

Those who have participated for money, or who have converted prizes into money or, without permission of the National Federation within the Rules of the International Federation concerned, have received prizes exceeding 50 Dollars in value, and those who have received presents which can be converted into money or other material advantages.

\*

Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame or success, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducement or promotion by reason of their sport performances rather than their ability, whether in commercial or industrial enterprises, the armed Services or any branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema, Radio, or any other paid activity.

\*

An athlete who becomes a professional in *any* sport or who has decided to become a professional or who plays in a professional team with a view to become a professional.

\*

Those who are paid for teaching or coaching others for competition in sport.

\*

Anyone awarded a scholarship mainly for his athletic ability.

\*

An athlete who demands payment or expense money for a manager, coach, relative or friend.

\*

Those who have received payment of expenses in excess of the actual outlay.

\*

Those whose occupation (studies or employment) has been interrupted for special training in a camp for more than four weeks in any one calendar year.

\*

Those who have received expense money for more than 30 days, exclusive of the time spent in travelling, in any one calendar year, except when:





- a) The National Federation concerned has given an extension to cover competition in the Olympic Games, Regional Games or Championships, or for genuine matches with other countries;
- b) The authorities of the International Federation concerned have granted a very limited extension in exceptional circumstances.

\*

Those who have neglected their usual vocation or employment for competitive sport whether at home or abroad.

\*

Any employment must be bona fide and not a cover for excessive opportunities for training or competition in sport.

\*

If an athlete is paid for the use of his name or picture or for a radio or television appearance, it is capitalization of athletic fame as described above. (Even if no payment is made, such practices are to be deplored, since in the minds of many, particularly the young, they undermine the exalted position rightly held by amateur champions.)

A competitor is permitted to receive

Travelling and living expenses corresponding to the actual outlay during competition, including the Olympic Games, and for a very limited period of training (no more than four weeks in any one calendar year), subject to approval of his National Olympic Committee.

\*

Clothing and equipment as required for practicing his sport from his amateur sport organization.

\*

Pocket money to cover petty daily expenses during the Games but only from his National Olympic Committee.

Contribution because of loss of salary

The International Olympic Committee in principle is opposed to payments for broken time which it considers an infraction of Olympic amateurism.

However, when a competitor can prove that his dependants are suffering hardship because of his (or her) loss of salary or wages while attending the Olympic Games, his National Olympic Committee may make a contribution to those dependants, but under no circumstances may it exceed the sum which he (or she) would have earned during his (or her) actual period of absence, which in turn must not exceed 30 days.



### Other decisions

An athlete paid for teaching elementary sport (beginners or school-children) on a temporary basis without abandoning his usual occupation remains eligible.

An athlete may be a full-time professional journalist, radio or television reporter or a full-time manager of or worker in an athletic facility without forfeiting his amateur status.

### Pseudo amateurs

Individuals subsidized by governments, educational institutions, or business concerns because of their athletic ability are not amateurs. Business and industrial concerns sometimes employ athletes for their advertising value. The athletes are given paid employment with little work to do and are free to practise and compete at all times. For national aggrandizement, governments occasionally adopt the same methods and give athletes positions in the Army, on the police force or in a government office. They also operate training camps for extended periods. Some colleges and universities offer outstanding athletes scholarships and inducements of various kinds. Recipients of these special favours which are granted only because of athletic ability are not eligible to compete in the Olympic Games.



## APPENDIX C

DATES, PLACES, AND NUMBERS OF OLYMPIC GAMES [SUMMER]  
AND OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES



DATES, PLACES, AND NUMBERS OF OLYMPIC GAMES [SUMMER]

Olympiad Number	Olympiad Dates	Olympic Games Number	Olympic Games Dates	Place	Number of Countries	Number of Athletes
I	1 Jan. 1896-31 Dec. 1899	1	6 Apr.-15 Apr. 1896	Athens, Greece	13	295 men
II	1 Jan. 1900-31 Dec. 1903	2	15 May-28 Oct. 1900	Paris, France	21	1066 men 11 women
III	1 Jan. 1904-31 Dec. 1907	3	1 July-29 Oct. 1904	St. Louis, U.S.A.	21	548 men 8 women
IV	1 Jan. 1908-31 Dec. 1911	4	27 Aug.-29 Oct. 1908	London, England	22	1998 men 36 women
V	1 Jan. 1912-31 Dec. 1915	5	5 May-22 July 1912	Stockholm, Sweden	28	2447 men 57 women
VI	1 Jan. 1916-31 Dec. 1919	N o t c e l e b r a t e d - g r a n t e d t o B e r l i n				
VII	1 Jan. 1920-31 Dec. 1923	6	20 Apr.-12 Sept. 1920	Antwerp, Belgium	29	2527 men 64 women
VIII	1 Jan. 1924-31 Dec. 1927	7	3 May-27 July 1924	Paris, France	44	2939 men 136 women
IX	1 Jan. 1928-31 Dec. 1931	8	28 July-12 Aug. 1928	Amsterdam, Holland	46	2708 men 263 women
X	1 Jan. 1932-31 Dec. 1935	9	31 July-7 Aug. 1932	Los Angeles, U.S.A.	38	1296 men 35 women
XI	1 Jan. 1936-31 Dec. 1939	10	1 Aug.-16 Aug. 1936	Berlin, Germany	49	3652 men 328 women





Olympiad Number	Olympiad Dates	Olympic Games Number	Olympic Games Dates	Place	Number of Countries	Number of Athletes
XII	1 Jan. 1940-31 Dec. 1943		N o t c e l e b r a t e d - g r a n t e d t o T o k y o , t h e n t o H e l s i n k i			
XIII	1 Jan. 1944-31 Dec. 1947		N o t c e l e b r a t e d - g r a n t e d t o L o n d o n			
XIV	1 Jan. 1948-31 Dec. 1951	11	29 July-14 Aug. 1948	London, England	58	3677 men 385 women
XV	1 Jan. 1952-31 Dec. 1955	12	19 July-3 Aug. 1952	Helsinki, Finland	69	5349 men 518 women
XVI	1 Jan. 1956-31 Dec. 1959	13	22 Nov.-8 Dec. 1956	Melbourne, Australia	67	2813 men 371 women
			10 June-17 June 1956	Stockholm, Sweden (equestrian only)	29	145 men 13 women
XVII	1 Jan. 1960-31 Dec. 1963	14	25 Aug.-11 Sept. 1960	Rome Italy	84	4859 men 537 women
XVIII	1 Jan. 1964-31 Dec. 1967	15	10 Oct.-24 Oct. 1964	Tokyo, Japan	94	4854 men 732 women
XIX	1 Jan. 1968-31 Dec. 1971	16	12 Oct.-27 Oct. 1968	Mexico City, Mexico	125	5782 men 844 women
XX	1 Jan. 1972-31 Dec. 1975	17	26 Aug.-10 Sept. 1972	Munich, Germany		
XXI	1 Jan. 1976-31 Dec. 1979	18	17 July-1 Aug. 1976	Montreal, Canada		



OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Olympic Games Number	Olympic Games Dates	Place	Number of Countries	Number of Athletes
1	25 Jan.-5 Feb. 1924	Chamonix, France	16	291 men 13 women
2	11 Feb.-19 Feb. 1928	St. Moritz, Switzerland	25	336 men 27 women
3	4 Feb.-13 Feb. 1932	Lake Placid, U.S.A.	17	257 men 21 women
4	6 Feb.-16 Feb. 1936	Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany	28	675 men 81 women
N o t c e l e b r a t e d - g a m e s o f 1 9 4 0 a n d 1 9 4 4				
5	30 Jan.-9 Feb. 1948	St. Moritz, Switzerland	28	801 men 77 women
6	14 Feb.-25 Feb. 1952	Oslo, Norway	30	624 men 108 women
7	26 Jan.-5 Feb. 1956	Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy	32	791 men 132 women
8	18 Feb.-28 Feb. 1960	Squaw Valley, U.S.A.	30	502 men 146 women
9	29 Jan.-9 Feb. 1964	Innsbruck, Austria	36	758 men 175 women
10	6 Feb.-18 Feb. 1968	Grenoble, France	37	1065 men 228 women
11	3 Feb.-13 Feb. 1972	Sapporo, Japan		



## APPENDIX D

NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEES, RULE 24,  
OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS, 1955



NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEES, RULE 24,  
OLYMPIC RULES AND REGULATIONS, 1955

National Olympic Committees

24. Only National Olympic Committees recognized and approved by the International Olympic Committee may enter competitors in the Olympic Games. Therefore, in order that contestants from a country can participate in the Olympic Games, a National Olympic Committee, conducting its activities in accordance with these Olympic regulations and the high ideals of the Olympic Movement, must be organized and accepted by the I.O.C.

National Olympic Committees shall have as their purpose, the development and protection of the Olympic Movement and of amateur sport. They shall cooperate with the national amateur sport governing bodies affiliated to the international federations recognized by the International Olympic Committee, in guarding and enforcing amateur rules. They shall have the exclusive right to use the Olympic flag and Olympic insignia, and shall confine their use and as far as possible that of the words "Olympic" and "Olympiad" to activities concerned with the Olympic Games (all commercial use of the Olympic flag and Olympic insignia is strictly forbidden). It is their duty, in cooperation with the national sport governing bodies (national federations), to organize and control the team that will represent their country in the Olympic Games. They shall arrange to equip, transport and house this team. They are patriotic organizations not for pecuniary profit, devoted to the promotion and encouragement of the physical, moral and cultural education of the youth of the nation, for the development of character, good health and good citizenship.

They shall enforce all the rules and regulations of the I.O.C.

*National Olympic Committees must be completely independent and autonomous and entirely removed from political, religious or commercial influence.*

Because of the importance of National Olympic Committees which are in complete charge of the Olympic Movement in their countries, great care must be exercised in choosing members, who should be men of good standing, upright character, sound judgement, independent mind, and a knowledge and belief in Olympic principles.

They must include in their membership:

- a) the members of the International Olympic Committee to that country, if any;
- b) at least one representative of proved service to his sport, nominated by each recognized national federation (association or governing body), whose sport is included in the Olympic Games programme. Individuals of this category must constitute a voting majority of the committee.





The following are not eligible to serve on a National Olympic Committee:

- a) A person who has ever competed as a professional;
- b) A person engaged in or connected with sport for personal profit;  
(It is not intended to exclude individuals occupying purely administrative positions in connection with amateur sport.)
- c) A person who has ever coached for payment.

A N.O.C. must not recognize more than one national federation in each sport and that federation must belong to the International Federation recognized by the I.O.C.

The members and officers of the N.O.C. and the members of its Executive Committee shall be elected at least every four years, at a N.O.C. meeting held expressly for that purpose. They may coopt in limited number to the Committee, persons who have rendered or can render exceptional service to the Olympic Movement.

Members of National Olympic Committees shall accept no salary or fee of any kind because of their position. They may, however, accept reimbursement for transportation, lodging and other proper expenses incurred by them in connection with their duties.

National Olympic Committees are responsible for the social and sport behaviour of their athletes and officials.

The National Olympic Committee is the official organization in full and complete charge of all Olympic matters in its own country. It handles all arrangements for taking part in the Olympic Games. All communications on such matters shall be addressed to it.

In order to obtain recognition, the rules and regulations, constitution and by-laws of National Olympic Committees, with a certified copy in French or English, must be sent to and approved by the International Olympic Committee. Any changes, not in accordance with I.O.C. rules and regulations, made in the constitution or by-laws must be reported to and approved by the International Olympic Committee.

In the event of any regulations or actions of the N.O.C. conflicting with I.O.C. rules, the I.O.C. member in that country must report the situation to the President of the I.O.C. for appropriate action. If there is no I.O.C. member in the country, the President has the power to appoint a member from another country to investigate and report to him.



## APPENDIX E

PROPOSAL BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC ACADEMY



## ANNEX XI

A/23

PROPOSAL BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC ACADEMY

---

Subject: Victory Ceremony

Proposition:

"I propose that during the Victory Ceremony at the Olympic Games neither the national flags of the winners be hoisted, nor the national anthem of the champion be played.

I propose, on the contrary, that just like in ancient Greece, each winner be saluted by the same flourish of trumpets."

Justification:

"The Olympic Games are in great danger of losing their soothing and uniting effect on humanity through the growing influence of political trends.

1. The Olympic Games should unite the youth of the world in a fair competition for victory.

Through their united contest for victory the young men and women should overcome all national differences and barriers.

Hoisting the national flags and playing the national anthems are contrary to these efforts.

2. Awarding the medal should do personal honour to the victorious athlete. It can not be denied that the hoisting of the national flag and the playing of the national anthem may have great significance for the individual athlete. It is, however, against good sense to impart the honour of victory to the winner's country by playing the anthem and hoisting its flag, thus distracting public attention from the personality of the athlete, which is done formally by the fact that all eyes are diverted from the athlete to the flag."



"3. Particularly at the Summer Games, one could speak of an [A/24] inflation of flag parades and national anthems with the numerous presentations of medals. It will be inevitable, with various competitions carried out at the same time, to repeat the ceremony with flags and anthems within a short lapse of time.

The ceremony proposed above, however, is more to the point, more modest and more in agreement with the feelings of our youth today which I have been able to gauge at the Olympic Academy.

I should like to underline my opinion by relating a few Olympic events which indicate that thinking in terms of national prestige threatens again to confuse the objectives of the Games:

- when governments make entering a team dependant upon the absence of another nation;
- when government representatives at the parade of nations rise from their seats only when their own national flag is shown;
- when a country's government takes the defence of its athletes who were eliminated for offending the rules against the international jury;
- when members of the jury give unusually high votes to their fellow countrymen, i.e. particularly low ones to the other competitors;

then the reasons are:

- abuse of the Olympic movement towards national and political ends and false national ambition.

The International Olympic Committee should, therefore, make it its objective to prevent the Olympic Games from developing more and more into statistics of national evaluation whereas the athletes merely fulfil the role of collecting points for their country."

\*

\*

✱

















**B30165**